

# Congressional Record.

## PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS THIRD SESSION.

### SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 18, 1921.

(Legislative day of Monday, February 14, 1921.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gooding	McLean	Spencer
Calder	Harris	McNary	Sutherland
Capper	Harrison	Moses	Swanson
Chamberlain	Heflin	New	Thomas
Colt	Henderson	Norris	Townsend
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Underwood
Dial	Kellogg	Philips	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kendrick	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Kenyon	Reed	Warren
Elkins	Knox	Sheppard	Williams
Fernald	La Follette	Simmons	Willis
France	Lenroot	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Smith, Md.	
Gay	McCumber	Smith, S. C.	
Gerry	McKellar	Smoot	

Mr. BALL. I wish to announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] are absent on official business, engaged as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

#### REFERENCE OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in open executive session, to have referred to the Committee on Military Affairs a number of nominations for promotions in the Army from the grade of first lieutenant to that of colonel, inclusive, which have been sent to the Senate in the last few days and which are now pending before the Senate and are in the office of the Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. I understand that does not go beyond the rank of colonel.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I said between the grades of first lieutenant and colonel.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not hear the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is that, as in open executive session, all nominations for promotions in the Army from the grade of first lieutenant up to and including the grade of colonel be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thought that had already been done.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Another batch of nominations has come in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations for the office of Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner of Patents be referred, as in open executive session, to the Committee on Patents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I make a similar request to that of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] with reference to certain nominations in the Steamboat-Inspection Service and several in the Coast and Geodetic Survey and in the Coast Guard. These are nominations made in the line of promotion and seniority. I ask, as in open executive session, that these nominations be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MOSES. May I inquire the grade of the officers referred to?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Those of the grade of first lieutenant, commander, and lieutenant commander. They are in line of promotion in the ordinary way, and not for any definite term, or anything of that kind.

Mr. SMOOT. Does it include the director of the service?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; no director, or anything of that kind; they are simply routine promotions.

Mr. SMOOT. I prefer to look over the list, and therefore I object at this time.

#### THE PATENT OFFICE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to fix a time for voting on the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11984) to increase the force and salaries in the Patent Office, and for other purposes. Objection was then made because of the absence from the Senate of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE]. I have seen the Senator from Connecticut, and he has no objection to the request I now make for unanimous consent that at 4 o'clock on next Monday the Senate shall vote on the conference report on House bill 11984.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have just asked that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] be sent for. He is desirous of being here. I ask the Senator from Nebraska to withhold his request until the Senator from Connecticut comes in.

Mr. NORRIS. I have talked with the Senator from Connecticut, and he himself has told me that he has no objection to the order, and I think he told me that in the presence of the Senator from Utah, who said he would be willing to take whatever action the Senator from Connecticut, who is against the conference report, was willing to take.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Connecticut said he had no objection to taking up the report.

Mr. NORRIS. I told the Senator from Connecticut explicitly what I had done, that I tried to get up the report yesterday, and that the Senator from Connecticut was not here, and I did not want to take it up in his absence. I told him what I would ask, and he told me explicitly that he had no objection to fixing a time for voting on the conference report.

Mr. SMOOT. There may be other objections to the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course.

Mr. SMOOT. If the amendments were the only questions that may arise, that would be one thing, but other questions affecting the bill may arise. Therefore, I could not agree to a specific hour for a vote. I will say to the Senator that I will vote with him to take up the conference report on Monday.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. May I ask what conference report is referred to?

Mr. NORRIS. It is the conference report on House bill 11984.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I mean from what committee?

Mr. NORRIS. From the Committee on Patents. Permit me to say now on this question that the bill has been under consideration by the Patent Committees of the House and the Senate for about a year. It has finally reached the stage where it is here in the shape of a conference report. I realize that there is objection to it. Some who are opposing it are doing so bitterly. I have no criticism to make of that. All I want is that the conference report shall be voted on by the Senate, and if it is voted down and the Senate does not want it, that is the end of it, of course, with me. But I have had it intimated to me, from a source that I consider absolutely reliable, that there is going to be an attempt in the Senate to prevent a vote on the proposition.

I have been physically unable to be here for some time. I probably will not be able to be here much of the time during the remainder of this session. I can not very well be here all the time trying to get the conference report up. I did not want to take it up, even if I could do so, to displace an appropriation bill. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] kindly consented that he would agree to lay aside temporarily the unfinished busi-

ness, the Post Office appropriation bill, if I could assure him that there would be no extended debate. Unfortunately I can not give that assurance, particularly when I have already been informed that there is going to be an attempt to prevent a vote on the conference report, and we are, I think, honestly and honorably entitled to a vote on the proposition.

There ought to be a vote on it. That is all I am asking. If next Monday is too soon, let us fix a later date. I am not particular when the vote is taken. I do not care if it is put off until a week from Monday, but it will be a great personal accommodation to me if I knew when we were going to have a vote on it, so that I could be here at that time even though I can not be continuously in attendance on the Senate. That is the reason why I have made this request.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I am not in the habit of objecting to requests for unanimous-consent agreements, because I wish to have the business of the Senate go forward; but at the present moment, when some of the great appropriation bills are not yet in conference and some of them have not yet passed the Senate, I do not think that I can agree to a request for unanimous consent to fix any early date, or, indeed, any date, to vote on questions which are concededly to be debated at length until we shall have gotten one or two of the very large and important appropriation bills out of the way.

I am not objecting to the Senator's conference report being adopted, if it shall not lead to debate. The only point I wish to impress is the necessity of getting into conference some of the important appropriation bills. For instance, the deficiency bill provides for paying people whose wages will be unpaid in many instances unless appropriation for that purpose is made, and the money proposed to be appropriated is to be expended between now and the 1st of July. It is very important that such bills should be passed.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I realize the truth of all that the Senator from Wyoming has stated, and I have not had any desire to interfere with the passage of appropriation bills. There is not a Senator here who is more anxious to dispose of those bills than I am. Although I was in favor of the tariff bill which was pending here, when the motion was made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to displace it and take up an appropriation bill I voted for his motion, because I thought under all the circumstances we were wasting time in the consideration of a bill which I did not believe could possibly become a law.

I do not care to discuss that matter now; but when Senators say that we shall be permitted to bring this conference report up if it will not lead to any debate, no matter how honest their intentions may be, if we are going to pursue that course it only gives aid to those who desire never to have a vote on the conference report, because I can not give the assurance that there will not be any debate. I am willing to vote now without any debate; I am willing that the matter should be debated as much as Senators wish to debate it; but I do not want, after we have gotten this far with it, to be faced with the proposition of having any limit fixed, so that it will be very easy to filibuster and prevent any action whatever.

Now, I submit to Senators that that would not be fair. I have an idea, in view of the strong opposition to this proposed legislation, that it may be defeated. I am not asking that the conference report be agreed to; I am not suggesting anything of that kind. If it should be defeated on a vote, that would be all right; I should not complain about it. I do contend, however, that under the circumstances there ought to be some agreement that we shall have a vote on the conference report before this session closes on the 4th of March. That is all I care for.

I do not care what time is set. If Senators will fix it for the 3d of March or any other time it will not displace any other matter, except during the time that it requires to call the roll and vote on it. Senators may discuss it when they wish to—they can do that now—and I may be forced into the position, if there can not be any time fixed for a vote, that I shall have to take the matter up myself and at least devote some time to debating it. I do not even care to do that.

As I have said, I am willing to submit the question without argument; but I can not let the matter rest, it seems to me, with fairness to myself and everybody else who has been behind the proposed legislation up to this time, and allow it to occupy such a position that it can be easily killed by a filibuster; indeed, if we wait until all the appropriation bills shall have been disposed of, the time remaining will be so short that it will hardly be proper to designate obstructive tactics as a filibuster.

I appeal to Senators that there be action on this important measure. Let any one of them fix the time for a vote. I do not care who fixes it or what time is fixed. Of course, outside of other considerations, it will be a personal favor to me, for reasons which I have stated, although I am not urging that.

If the request to fix next Monday as the time for a vote is objected to, I ask unanimous consent that the date be fixed one week from to-day, next Friday, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, and that the Senate shall vote then on the conference report.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am going to object to unanimous consent to vote upon the conference report, but I will say to the Senator any time after to-morrow that he desires to move to take up the conference report I will be perfectly willing to vote to take it up. I am not, however, going to give unanimous consent at this time to vote upon it at a certain time.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, Mr. President, that means that my fears were well founded, and the probabilities are, with all the appropriation bills that are coming up, the proposed legislation will be killed indirectly when, perhaps, Senators might be able to kill it directly. I should like to have a yea-and-nay vote upon it, and have the question decided.

#### NOMINATION OF FRED K. NIELSEN.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in open executive session, the nomination of Mr. Fred K. Nielsen as Solicitor for the State Department be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I am authorized by the Committee on the Judiciary, after considering it, and by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to make this request. I do not think there will be any objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

#### REFUND OF INCOME TAXES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to Senate resolution 425, January 18, 1921, a report regarding the number of claims for refund, abatement, or credit against assessment of income, surtax, excess or war profits taxes for the years 1917, 1918, and 1919, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. H. Overhue, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 16100) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WILLIS presented memorials of Windhorst Court of the Catholic Order of Foresters, of Cincinnati; St. Clara's Auxiliary No. 98, Knights of St. John, of Cincinnati; St. Cecelia Ladies' Auxiliary No. 58, Knights of St. John, of Hamilton; and St. Joseph Court No. 1221, Catholic Order of Foresters, of Portsmouth, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the loan to Great Britain of any money raised through the sale of Liberty bonds, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions of Pangburn Local No. 3234, of the F. E. and C. U. of A., of Pangburn, Ark., and Eureka Grange No. 311, of La Plata County, Colo., favoring legislation to prohibit gambling in grain products, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of the Merchant Tailors' Association, of Kansas City, Mo., favoring the truth-in-fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Andale, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. COLT presented a resolution of L'Union St. Jean-Baptiste D'Amerique, of Woonsocket, R. I., protesting against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.



Mr. FALL. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two telegrams from the Legislature of Porto Rico.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SAN JUAN, February 11, 1921—6.40 a. m.

Senator FALL,  
Chairman, Washington, D. C.:

House of representatives in session assembled requests you to express to the Senate the sentiments of adherence and respect of the representatives of the people of Porto Rico for the Representatives of the national sovereignty looking for that justice worthy of both in the granting of our immediate aspirations in the extension and a development of our present system of government under democratic principles.

CAYETANO COLL CUCHI, Speaker.

SAN JUAN, February 18, 1921—6.45 a. m.

Senator FALL,  
Washington, D. C.:

Senate of Porto Rico in session assembled unanimously requests you to express to the Senate the sentiments of adherence and respect of the senators of Porto Rico to the United States Senators looking for that justice worthy of both in the granting of our immediate aspirations in the extension and development of our present system of government under democratic principles.

BARCELO, President.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented a memorial of the Legislature of Nebraska, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures, as follows:

Resolution favoring the nationalizing of the coal industry in the United States.

Whereas the annual coal production in the United States amounts to over 600,000,000 tons; and

Whereas coal production in the United States is carried on at many mines widely varying in their depth of seam, conditions of mining and cost of production; and

Whereas it has been found that fixing a price in the market, either by the Government or by market conditions, does injustice in many cases, since if the price is fixed high enough for the mines having the highest cost of production, the profit to the mines having a lower cost of production is too great, and if the price is fixed by the cost of production at the mines where production is cheapest, the market price is too low for the other mines, resulting either in shutting down the mine or reducing the price of labor thereat; and

Whereas the war situation made it clear that justice to the coal miner and to the coal consumer could be obtained only by nationalizing the mines, thereby enabling the Government to direct the production of coal at the places where it could be produced at the greatest advantage to society as a whole and marketed under uniform conditions both as to price and to coal miners' wages; and

Whereas in Europe, in Australia, in South Africa, in Canada, as well as in the United States, the ablest economists as well as the best business minds are now favoring the nationalizing of the coal industry in each of these countries: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That we favor the enactment of Federal laws which will provide in a just and equitable way for nationalizing the coal industry in the United States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the chief clerk to each of our Senators and Congressmen at Washington, with a request that they favor the introduction and passage of such an act by Congress.

Introduced by Representatives George C. Snow, of Chadron, and Harry A. Foster, of Omaha.

Mr. McKELLAR presented a resolution of the Legislature of Tennessee, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

House joint resolution by O. C. Norton.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Tennessee (the Senate concurring), That our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States be requested to support a measure now pending in the Congress known as the France-Langley bill, which, if enacted, would bring about erection of hospitals for sick and wounded soldiers of the World War; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to each Senator and Congressman from Tennessee.

He also presented a resolution of the Legislature of Tennessee, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

Whereas the world-wide extension of popular government has placed upon the masses of the people responsibilities never borne by their forefathers, and has made more necessary than before universal education as a means of social self-defense; and

Whereas the development of communication and transportation has brought all sections of the country into such intimate relations that ignorance and its attending vice in any part of the country is a menace to the welfare of every other section so that the responsibility for public instruction can no longer be regarded as merely of local, county, or State concern; and

Whereas the children of the States are to become the citizens of the United States, as well as of their respective States, and as such are to have national obligations and responsibilities; and

Whereas the State of Tennessee has recognized by statute the obligation of its wealthier sections to aid in the education of the children of less-favored districts, on the principle that revenue for school purposes should be collected where the income is expended where the children are; and

Whereas a bill is now pending in the Congress of the United States providing for the acceptance of national responsibility for and aid to public education through the appropriation of \$100,000,000 to the several States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, That we hereby memorialize Congress immediately to enact into law the Smith-Towner bill, known as education bill, S. 1017; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of these resolutions be sent to the Clerks of the two Houses of the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and Representatives from Tennessee be informed of this action.

Mr. McKELLAR presented a resolution of the Legislature of Tennessee, which was referred to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures, as follows:

Resolution on metric system.

Whereas there is in the United States a deplorable lack of uniformity in weights and measures, and the units used are unscientific, cumbersome, and unrelated, constituting an actual hindrance to education, industry, world trade, and the activities of daily life; and

Whereas the metric system of weights and measures is a decimal system, simple, logical, and easy to use, so that its adoption will result in an incalculable saving in time and energy; and

Whereas the metric system has been adopted by the vast majority of enlightened nations, and its adoption by the United States is calculated to promote friendly relations and commerce with all the world; and

Whereas the State of Tennessee, by reason of its great commercial and industrial activities, is vitally interested both as a State and in behalf of its citizens in the speedy adoption of world-wide uniform standards of weights and measures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we respectfully urge that the units of the metric system be adopted by the Congress of the United States as the legal standards of weights and measures after a transition period of 10 years, as proposed in bills now before Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be forwarded to the President of the United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Tennessee in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR presented three resolutions of the Legislature of Tennessee, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

STATE OF TENNESSEE,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Nashville, February 16, 1921.

House joint resolution by J. Q. McDonald.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Tennessee (the Senate concurring), That our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States be requested to support a measure now pending in the Congress known as the Fordney bill, which, if enacted, would bring about adjusted compensation for all honorable discharged men and women who served in the late war; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to each Senator and Congressman from Tennessee.

House joint resolution by Mr. Smith of Blount.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee (the Senate concurring), That we memorialize the Congress of the United States, through our Senators and Congressmen, to pass the bill now pending before Congress known as the Wason bill, which decentralizes the War Risk Insurance Department of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this house be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and Congressmen of the State of Tennessee.

House joint resolution.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee (the Senate concurring), That we request the Congress of the United States through our Senators and Congressmen to pass the bill now pending before Congress, known as the Rogers bill, which combines the Health Department, the War Risk Insurance Department, and the Vocational Training Department; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this house be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and Congressmen of the State of Tennessee.

Mr. HARRIS presented a resolution of the Atlanta City Federation of Women's Clubs, of Atlanta, Ga., favoring legislation extending the Federal aid road-building program, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution of the Atlanta City Federation of Women's Clubs, of Atlanta, Ga., favoring an amendment to House bill 12078 providing for the promotion of vocational education, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution of the Atlanta City Federation of Women's Clubs, of Atlanta, Ga., favoring legislation strengthening the Volstead Act by placing all prohibition enforcement agents under civil-service rules, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution of the Atlanta City Federation of Women's Clubs, of Atlanta, Ga., favoring legislation providing for the protection of maternity and infancy, which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 5017) granting an increase of pension to James Mellor, jr. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 5019) to amend sections 2, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 32 of the Federal farm loan act, approved July 17, 1916, as amended, and to amend sections 2, 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 of the United States warehouse act, approved August 11, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

A bill (S. 5020) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the termination of Federal control of railroads and systems of transportation; to provide for the settlement of disputes between carriers and their employees; to further amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico:

A bill (S. 5021) for the relief of Fred V. Plomteaux; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 5022) providing for and establishing scholarships in each of the States as a memorial to the American soldiers, sailors, and marines who gave their lives for their country and as an expression of appreciation to the brave and loyal men who served in the military and naval forces of the United States in the late war; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 5023) to provide for the closing of Cedar Road between Quincy Street and Shepherd Street NW., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 5024) granting an increase of pension to Izora B. McGill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 5025) declaring Lake George, Yazoo County, Miss., to be a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 261) repealing section 10 of the river and harbor act approved March 2, 1919; to the Committee on Commerce.

#### TRAINING PAY AND ALLOWANCES.

Mr. KENYON introduced a bill (S. 5018) to amend the vocational rehabilitation act to exempt from taxation amounts heretofore or hereafter received thereunder as training pay and allowances, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the bill introduced by me to amend the vocational training act should be referred, I believe, to the Committee on Finance. The situation which prompts the introduction of the bill is rather an odd one. The training pay given to soldiers is subject to the income tax, while under the war risk insurance act the compensation paid by that bureau is expressly exempted from the income tax. It is rather an emergency matter, and I think if the Finance Committee can take it up and dispose of it at this session it should probably go there and be considered as an amendment to the vocational training act. I should like, however, to ask the Senator from North Dakota if there is any prospect of a measure of that kind being considered by the Finance Committee at the present session?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think so. If it is a matter that needs to be considered, I think the committee will consider it.

Mr. KENYON. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. KNOX submitted an amendment providing that the accounting officers of the Treasury shall readjudicate in accordance with certain court decisions all claims of Army officers for pay within such court decisions, without regard to former disallowances by Treasury officials, and report the same to Congress as audited claims, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted an amendment providing that the Secretary of War be authorized to ascertain the requirements of the Department of Agriculture for its own use and that of the several States in road work and maintenance of roads and other executive departments as pertaining to motor vehicles, and after supplying the needs of the several departments as authorized and directed under existing legislation to sell as soon as possible any remaining motor trucks and automobiles that are surplus and not needed by the War Department, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill,

which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment providing that Lake George, in Yazoo County, Miss., be declared a nonnavigable stream, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that any stream or body of water lying wholly within one State which is not a navigable stream or body of water under the laws of the State in which it lies is declared a nonnavigable waterway of the United States within the meaning of the law until work of improvement has been undertaken by the United States, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation to carry into effect the provisions of the act approved March 2, 1897, entitled "An act to prevent the importation of impure and unwholesome tea," as amended, etc., from \$30,000 to \$38,000, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION BILL.

Mr. HARRISON submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 14461, the immigration bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### ANNUAL MEETING OF STATE AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONERS (S. DOC. NO. 409).

Mr. MOSES. From the Committee on Printing I report a resolution providing for the printing of a certain manuscript, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The reading clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 455), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the manuscript entitled "Report of fourth annual meeting of the National Association of State Commissioners of Agriculture" be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, what is the report referred to in the resolution?

Mr. MOSES. It is the report of the annual convention of the State Commissioners of Agriculture held at the Department of Agriculture and participated in by the commissioners of agriculture from all the States in the Union.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator if the document has already been printed by the Agricultural Department?

Mr. MOSES. No; it has never been printed at all.

Mr. SMOOT. If it has been printed as a departmental document, I shall object to the request.

Mr. MOSES. I repeat that it has never been printed at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### REPORT OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION (S. DOC. NO. 408).

Mr. MOSES. From the Committee on Printing I report a resolution, S. Res. 456. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the report of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1920, be printed as a Senate document.

#### GREAT FALLS POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in connection with the reports from the Committee on Printing and while the matter is before the Senate, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether the Committee on Printing has taken up the report of Maj. Tyler and the report of the Water Power Commission?

Mr. MOSES. I will say to the Senator that the estimate of the cost for printing the latter document has not yet come from the Public Printer. The estimate for the original Tyler report has been received, but the estimate for the supplemental report later ordered by the Senate has not come.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the estimate, I will ask the Senator, for the printing of the original Tyler report?

Mr. MOSES. I do not at the moment recall, but my general impression is that the estimate is something like \$800.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the committee act on it?

Mr. MOSES. The committee is to clear its calendar on the 24th day of the present month.



## THE COTTON AND WHEAT SITUATION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed, on yesterday, Senate resolution 443.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator state the purport of the resolution? I do not recognize it by number.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is Senate resolution 443, authorizing the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make certain investigations. I desire the motion I have made to be noted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Washington will be entered.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 16100) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

## POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15441) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, in a few moments the Senate will vote upon a motion to suspend the rules to make in order as an amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill the bill which passed the House of Representatives by a very large vote. That bill carries an appropriation of \$100,000,000 to carry on the work of road building in the various States of the Union.

I did not think, Mr. President, when I heard of that action on the part of the House that there would be any trouble at this end of the Capitol. Members of the House talked to me about that measure, and I expressed the opinion that it would pass the Senate by an overwhelming vote. I did not believe that it would be the policy of the other side of this Chamber to attempt to practice economy at the expense and to the injury of road construction in the United States. I did not believe that any Senator in this Chamber would take the position that this work should be halted for a moment, and I was surprised and astounded to hear the arguments made yesterday in behalf of such a program as that.

Mr. President, Great Britain has buried in Westminster Abbey a soldier representing the rank and file of the British Army. This great and kindly act was done in honor of the unknown dead. Great Britain buried in this resting place of her kings one of the plain people, a private in the ranks of her army, one who came up from the common walks of life to fight and die for his country. She has shown her appreciation of the valor and heroism displayed by this boy and his comrades among the unknown dead. France has performed a like service in honor of her heroic dead who sleep in unknown graves. In both instances honor and gratitude are shown to the rank and file of the people. I submit to the Senators on the other side of this Chamber that while they are holding up legislation looking to the benefit of our soldiers who won the war, while they are blocking legislation looking to proper compensation for our boys, they might at least permit this road building to go on, because in this way they can express their appreciation of and gratitude to the great rank and file of our people who gave their sons to fight and die for our country.

As I said on yesterday, there is perhaps no other Government program that will serve so many people, that will reach into so many localities, that will really bless and benefit so many American citizens, as will this program of road building. Every State in the Union is interested. It is true some of the States had nearly completed their road construction under the bonding system; but I submit that the Senators from those States ought not to stand in the way of cooperative road construction in other States. Some States are richer than others, and they have gone on more rapidly with this work. They ought now to encourage road building in the other sections of our great country.

I regret to see that some Senators are willing to stop this road construction entirely. I regret to see that those in charge of legislation in this body, responsible to the people for legislation, are ready now to sidetrack this great work of road construction by the United States Government. There is no better or greater work that can be done by the Government. We must have transportation facilities by railroad, transportation facilities by waterway, and transportation facilities by highway, by public roads; and this Government will not have discharged its full duty to the people of the country until it has a splendid system of public highways reaching all through the States.

There are many ways in which Senators who want to cut down expenses can do it and lay off this project of road building.

Mr. President, \$100,000,000 is not so much. We have 105,000,000 people. So it costs less than \$1 per capita to carry on this great work of building up the public highways of the country.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

Mr. MOSES. The difficulty with the Senator's argument is that it is not paid per capita. The money is taken from the rich and thrifty States of the North to be spent in the Senator's State down South.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Senator has admitted just about what I had thought he felt. The States that have already built up their highways and that have by reason of a high discriminating tariff system been pillaging and plundering the people of the South, for that is how, to a large extent, they got their money—

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, my State paid \$30,000,000 for southern cotton last year in one mill alone.

Mr. HEFLIN. Thirty million dollars; and what did they get for the finished product? I will tell the Senator that on one occasion a few years ago Great Britain paid \$400,000,000 to America for her cotton supply and sold the remainder of the finished product, after supplying all of her possessions, for \$610,000,000, \$210,000,000 more than she paid us for the raw material; and the cotton mills of the Senator's State have for many years fattened upon low-priced cotton that they have purchased in the Southern States. But I want to serve notice on the Senator now that you will pay more for cotton this fall than you have paid in a long, long time because the low price to which you have driven cotton is going to cause us to produce the smallest crop that you have ever seen come to the markets of this country in a long time.

Mr. MOSES. I am glad to be put upon notice by the Senator; and I want to congratulate him, while this colloquy is going on, upon the facility with which he can manage to connect the veterans of the World War with an appropriation.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator from New Hampshire raised the sectional issue. He charged that I wanted to tax his people to build up the roads down in my section of the country. I want to say to the Senator that I would be willing to tax the whole people to build up any part of this great country. I have no feeling of sectional prejudice. There is none of it in my head or heart. I think the time has come when it should disappear forever in the United States. There certainly was none of it on the firing line in France, when our boys fought together side by side and many thousands died together on the fields of France. But the Senator says that I and others who stand here and champion the cause of the masses of the country want to tax his people to build up the highways down in my State. Mr. President, Alabama is part and parcel of this great Government. She contributes to its support generously and to the best of her ability. Of course, she has not had the opportunity—and I doubt whether she would have employed it if she had—to pillage and plunder so many people as some of the Senator's constituents have.

Mr. MOSES. In view of Muscle Shoals, Mr. President, that comes with good grace from the Senator.

Mr. HEFLIN. That was a meritorious measure and a project in the interest of all the people. I do not mean to cast any reflection upon the people of the Senator's State, but I am sure that the profiteers in his State who have made colossal fortunes during the war would like to sit back and continue to clip their coupons and pass undisturbed by the taxgatherers of the Republic.

Mr. MOSES. But we can not pass undisturbed by the taxgatherers so long as schemes of this kind go on. On the contrary, my State is one with almost a stationary population, with slight increase in its inventory for taxation purposes year by year; yet we have taxed ourselves, bonded ourselves, and built our own roads, and there is no reason why the State of Alabama should not do the same thing.

Mr. HEFLIN. The State of Alabama is doing the same thing. The cities are contributing, the counties are contributing, many of them have issued bonds for this purpose, and they are now working on this cooperative plan in building roads in my State. The States have contributed over \$600,000,000, while the Government has contributed less than a third of that amount.

But, Mr. President, it is not any strange thing to hear the Senator and other members of his party raise their voices in protest against legislation that helps the mass of the people. I do not recall a single measure of benefit to the great mass of our

people that had its origin in the brain of a Republican Senator; but if you get up a bill here for the special interests you will not have any trouble about getting it through. They will smile blandly and just slip and slide the project through, and no one over there ever makes an argument against it; nobody says it is unconstitutional; nobody ever says it is paternalism; and they get it through. But let somebody get up here with a bill that benefits the mass of the people or the people back in the rural districts of the country, or that will be of service to the school boy and girl who travel the public roads and they rise up and say, "Mr. President, we just must begin to practice economy right now." So they are ready to practice economy then, to the detriment and injury of the great mass of the American people.

Mr. President, from the juggling that I have seen going on around here this morning and late yesterday afternoon I do not know what is going to be the judgment of the Senators on the other side on this proposition. I should not be surprised if they intend to put to sleep this road-building program that the people of the country approve so unanimously.

Forty-three States await your judgment to-day. Forty-three States are watching the appropriation bills that go through Congress, and when they see you attempt to chloroform and put to sleep the road-building part of the legislative program they are justly indignant. You may postpone it, you may set it aside for a time, but there is nothing that is so vital to the people—that touches, I repeat, so many of them—as this very project, and you can not stop it. I repeat, the people are going to be indignant. They ought to be indignant. They ought to resent and, I believe will, repudiate your action if you side-track this great constructive measure.

A hundred million dollars? Why, you spend that in various ways where it will benefit less than a quarter of a million of people.

Mr. President, I am going to vote for this measure. I am going to vote to suspend the rules to put this amendment upon the bill, because it is the only way that we can carry on this road-building program. This work ought to go on. This Government is working out its ideals of constructive development in bridges that span the rivers, in opening up streams to navigation, in belting the country with steel rails for transportation purposes; and I repeat that the system will not be complete until we build public highways in the counties, in the States, and through the Nation. Let the Senate go upon record as favoring the working out of our ideals in such practical and beneficial fashion, and then a great and grateful people will rise up and call you blessed.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I regret very much that an attempt has been made to inject sectionalism into the consideration of this vital matter. I had hoped we might get away from sectional lines in our legislation. I do not see why the New England States, which happily began road construction work a little ahead of the other States of the Union, should now, because they have already built a good part of their roads, attempt to throttle the Congress in its efforts to assist road construction in other parts of the country.

Mr. President, despite the aid rendered by the Government, the Southern and Western States will, themselves, have to build the greater part of their roads. What New England has already done in this respect the other States will have to do hereafter for it is not expected the Government will match more than a small part of the total expenditure of the States for this purpose. The sum of \$100,000,000 a year, distributed among the 48 States of this Union, is a mere bagatelle to their total annual expenditure for roads. It is not much over \$2,000,000 a year to each State. That would not go far. It would not build many miles of good roads in the South; it would not build many miles of good roads in the West. The South and the West ultimately will have to do most of their road construction with their own resources. This Federal appropriation would be only supplementary, and supplementary to a small degree. Its chief value would not be in the amount of money the Federal Government would contribute, but in the psychological effect of the larger unit coming to the assistance of the lesser and the weaker unit and helping in the work. The value of the impetus thus given would be in the future, as it has been in the past, very great.

My friend from the State of New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] has referred to the fact that his State has paid such a large amount of taxes to the Government while the Southern States are poor and do not pay in the same proportion. I want to say to the Senator that while the Southern States have been poor, and are yet relatively poor, the Southern States are rapidly growing in wealth, they are rapidly becoming large taxpayers. In the last fiscal year North Carolina paid in taxes into the Federal Treasury over \$160,000,000.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. I rejoice in the prosperity and progress of the Southern States, Mr. President. No Member of the Senate could have further from his thought than I the notion of raising a sectional issue with reference to this matter. But, Mr. President, I saw these road bills in their progress through the last Congress; I saw the attempt made to secure credit for the States which had already built their road systems to the extent to which they had expended their money. I tried to secure an amendment whereby the amount of Federal money spent by the military forces in building roads through the States should be taken out from the quota assigned to those States, but all to no avail.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I can not yield for a speech; I have only 10 minutes. I want to say to the Senator from New Hampshire, and I want to say to my other colleagues from New England, that North Carolina does not expect the Federal Government to build its roads. If this bill passes, the Federal Government will contribute to road construction in North Carolina not exceeding \$4,000,000 in the coming year. Is not that true, I ask the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, will not the Senator be able to give me two or three minutes before the time for a vote arrives?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; I will. I say, that if this amendment to the bill is adopted the Government will contribute to North Carolina road construction during the current year approximately only about \$4,000,000.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. SIMMONS. I can not yield.

There are only 10 minutes left, and the Senator from Michigan has asked me to give him part of it. As I said, \$4,000,000 is a mere bagatelle to the amount of money we are spending in North Carolina for road construction.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. SIMMONS. I can not yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I simply wanted to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will yield for a question.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should like to ask what the Senator's State paid in income and internal revenue taxes to the Government?

Mr. SIMMONS. Something between thirty and forty million dollars. Income and profit taxes, and in all taxes, as I stated before, over \$160,000,000, fiscal year 1920. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It does.

Mr. SIMMONS. Two counties, Mr. President, adjoining the county in which I live, only the past year voted about \$4,000,000 to build roads within their boundaries, and probably there are near a score of counties in North Carolina in the past 18 months that have voted from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000 each for the construction of roads; and on yesterday, or the day before yesterday, the lower house of the legislature of my State passed a bill which, when it becomes a law, will bond North Carolina for \$50,000,000 with which to build good roads. We shall very probably spend in North Carolina every year several times as much money as we would get from the Federal Government under the pending amendment. That money will be spent in building the character of roads New England has already built, county roads and local roads mostly of permanent construction, so far as any road is permanent.

The money we hope for from the Government will be used chiefly in connection with the construction of a coordinated State system—a connected system of inter and intra State roads. We want the psychological effect of the Government aid and cooperation in this great work. We know the Government is not going to assist in all our road-construction work, and we do not ask it to do it. We know that it is impossible with the appropriations that are being made or that will be made. We are not indulging upon any such hope.

I am speaking hurriedly and perhaps disconnectedly, because I want to yield a part of my time to the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Michigan yesterday, in his discussion, inadvertently against the system of building with Federal money short stretches of disconnected roads here and there over the States—local roads having no coordination or connection with any system of roads. I agree with the Senator. I doubt very much that such a course is a wise expenditure of



Federal money. I do not believe it will receive that public approval which is needed to encourage a larger participation by the Government in this work.

But, Mr. President, I think the system we are about to adopt in North Carolina is such as to deserve Federal aid. Our purpose in North Carolina is to use the Federal contribution for the purpose of building main highways, with which the local roads built by the State and the counties are to be coordinated and connected into one grand, harmonious working road system in that State. It is said that under the amendment of the Senator from Virginia this money will have to be spent in the way it has heretofore been spent—by State selection of the roads upon which it is to be spent, however disconnected and lacking in coordination and relation the one to the other. I want to say to the Senator that I agree in the main with his theory; but if we shall suspend the rule to-day and permit a vote upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from Michigan can offer an amendment so as to make it conform with his theory, if the Senate agrees with him; and, as I feel now, I shall be inclined to cooperate with the Senator in supporting such amendment, because I think that would be probably the wiser way in which to work out this, and would remove much of the opposition to further Government expenditures in this behalf and to larger contributions on the part of the Government in the future.

I trust that Senators from New England, from the North, and from every section of the country will vote to suspend the rule and let us consider this matter upon its merits, and although the Senate may not adopt the exact language and the method prescribed in the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, let us thrash this thing out here and now and adopt a wise, logical system of road construction providing for the aid of the Federal Government to be given to the State in systematic and coordinated building of good roads.

While I have other matters I wish to discuss, I recognize that the Senator in charge of this matter is entitled to some time, and I shall not consume the remaining five minutes before the hour fixed in the agreement for a vote on the motion to suspend the rules of the Senate so as to make the amendment of the Senator from Virginia in order.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. There is not a great deal of difference, that I can see, between the Senator from North Carolina and myself as to what ought to be done with the Federal aid money. I am just as certain, however, as I am that I live that any proposition submitted at this time on the floor of the Senate to change the present Federal aid law, such as the Senator suggests, would be voted down by those Senators who insist that the present method should be maintained.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there has been no opportunity for the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, which has this matter in charge, to even consider it. I again want to repudiate the statement made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] and by others to the effect that the defeat of this amendment is going to check road building in the United States. There is no more question about the fact than there is that I am addressing you that the first duty of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads in the new Congress will be to take up the subject of Federal contributions to the project of road building.

The fact of the matter is, and it has not been denied, that a very large amount of money already invested by the Federal Government in road construction has been wasted. There is no question about that at all.

Mr. HEFLIN rose.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I can not yield; I have only two or three minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. I question the statement that a large amount of it has been wasted.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I mean that anybody who understands the subject, anybody who has investigated the question of road building and road construction in the United States—

Mr. HEFLIN. If I understood the Senator correctly, I do not agree to his statement to the effect that a large amount of this money has been wasted.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, the very men who ask for the continuation of the present appropriation under existing conditions, when they properly understand the subject, agree, just as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] agrees, that this money should be expended in a manner different from that in which it is being expended in many of the States of the Union.

This is not a sectional question with me at all. I simply want the Federal money expended for a Federal purpose, which

will assist in the construction of roads and in the establishment of proper systems of roads. All I am asking is that, as this bill, which comes to us from the Committee on Roads of the House of Representatives, has never been considered by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads in the Senate, which has jurisdiction of the matter, we be given an opportunity to consider it, without embarrassment to legitimate road building in the United States; that it be put off for just a few days, until the committee which has been considering some phases of it can have time to complete its work on this great matter.

So, Mr. President, I am hoping at least that the Members of the Senate who want to see the expenditure of Federal money properly safeguarded will give us this opportunity.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I can not yield; I have but half a minute. Mr. President, I hope that none of the Senators on the other side have been persuaded to stay away from the Senate this morning for the purpose of reducing the honest vote of the Senate on this great subject. I wish we could have all of the Senators vote on this question, and thus determine if, after proper understanding, two-thirds of the Senate believe that at this time and under these conditions we should vote \$100,000,000 when it can not be properly expended; if they want to do that, and take this out of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, who desire to consider it, and who will consider it without delay, then I shall make no further objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, reference has been made to the failure of some States to make appropriations so as to cooperate with the Government in the building of good roads. This is not true of my State, as most of our counties are voting large bond issues for this purpose. The Government appropriation for good roads has been wise, and I sincerely hope this appropriation may be continued. I shall give it my hearty support.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 12 o'clock having arrived, the Secretary will, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, call the roll upon the pending question, which is the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] to suspend the rule.

Mr. LODGE. I make the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unanimous-consent agreement is that the vote shall be taken at 12 o'clock. The Secretary will call the roll on the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EDGE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. I am unable to obtain a transfer. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I am unable to get a transfer, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. SWANSON (when Mr. GLASS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. GLASS] is paired with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. If present and not paired, my colleague would vote "yea."

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick], which I transfer to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. As I am unable to obtain a transfer of my pair, it will be necessary for me to withhold my vote.

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I propose to vote, and I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. EDGE. I find that I can transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE], which I do, and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GLASS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. I am advised that I am released from that pair and at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Has the senior Senator from Maryland voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with that Senator, and for that reason I am compelled to withhold my vote.

Mr. KENDRICK. I made the statement a moment ago that I was unable to secure a transfer of my pair. I have since arranged for a transfer of my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY]. I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. HARRISON. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] are detained on official business.

The roll call resulted—yeas 42, nays 33, as follows:

## YEAS—42.

Ashurst	Gore	McKellar	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Gronna	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Capper	Hale	Myers	Stanley
Chamberlain	Harris	Overman	Sterling
Culberson	Harrison	Phelan	Sutherland
Curtis	Heflin	Pittman	Swanson
Dial	Henderson	Ransdell	Trammell
Fletcher	Hitchcock	Reed	Underwood
Gay	Jones, N. Mex.	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
Glass	Kellogg	Simmons	
Gooding	Kendrick	Smith, Ariz.	

## NAYS—33.

Ball	Jones, Wash.	McLean	Townsend
Borah	Kenyon	Moses	Wadsworth
Brandevage	Keyes	Nelson	Walsh, Mass.
Calder	King	New	Warren
Colt	Knox	Phipps	Willis
Edge	La Follette	Polindexter	Wolcott
Elkins	Lenroot	Smoot	
Fernald	Lodge	Spencer	
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Thomas	

## NOT VOTING—21.

Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Smith, Md.
Dillingham	Kirby	Penrose	Watson
Fall	McCormick	Pomerene	Williams
France	Newberry	Robinson	
Gerry	Norris	Sherman	
Johnson, Calif.	Owen	Shields	

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas are 42 and the nays 33. Two-thirds not having voted in favor of the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senate refuses to suspend the rule.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to offer as an amendment to the bill a part of the amendment which I offered on yesterday. The purpose of the amendment is to allow the service of substitute carriers, who served in the Army of the United States, in any branch of the military service, to be counted in the Postal Service for the purposes of longevity pay, rank, and so forth.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. Is this the same as the second part of the amendment which was offered by the Senator on yesterday?

Mr. LODGE. It is the same as the second part of the amendment which I offered yesterday. I offer it again because I think it is a great injustice not to allow those men who went into the military service to receive this credit. It was generally understood that they should receive the credit, and I think they ought to have it. I hope that the chairman of the committee will not make a point of order against the amendment in that form.

Mr. POMERENE. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Massachusetts has said.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Insert, at the bottom of page 5, the following:

That that portion of the act reclassifying salaries of postmasters and postal employees, approved June 5, 1920, which provides "that hereafter substitute clerks in first and second class post offices and substitute letter carriers in the City Delivery Service when appointed regular clerks or carriers shall have credit for actual time served on a basis of one year for each 300 days of 8 hours served as substitute, and appointed to the grade to which such clerk or carrier would have progressed had his original appointment as substitute been to grade 1" shall be amended by adding the following: *Provided*, That clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and substitute clerks and substitute carriers who served in the military or naval services during the World War and have not reached the maximum grade of salary shall receive credit for all time served in the military or naval services on the basis of one day's credit of 8 hours in the Postal Service for each day served in the military or naval service and be promoted to the grade to which such clerk or carrier or substitute clerk or substitute carrier would have progressed had his original appointment as substitute been to grade 1.

The provisions herein shall be effective as of date of passage of the original act of June 5, 1920.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. I believe it was the intention of Congress that this should be done. I remember that two or three years ago I proposed such an amendment and it was adopted, but it has been construed to apply only to the year covered by the appropriation bill, which was not intended by me. I recognize the facts as stated by the Senator from Massachusetts and I am in hearty sympathy with carrying out all the pledges that were made by the Government to the soldiers in the war. Therefore, I have no objection to the amendment and trust that we shall be able to keep it in the bill in conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I gave notice on yesterday of a motion to suspend the rule so that I could offer an amendment to the pending bill. I now make that motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be read so that the Senate may know what it is to vote on.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] gave notice on the legislative day of February 14, calendar day of February 17, that under Rule XL to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI, in order that he might propose and have considered the following amendment to House bill 15441, the Post Office appropriation bill:

At the end of the bill add another section to read as follows:

"Sec. —. That section 6 of an act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes, approved July 11, 1916, as amended,' is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. That any State desiring to avail itself of the benefits of this act shall, by its State highway department, submit to the Secretary of Agriculture project statements setting forth proposed construction of any rural post road or roads therein. If the Secretary of Agriculture approve a project, the State highway department shall furnish to him such surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates thereof as he may require: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall approve only such projects as may be substantial in character and the expenditure of funds hereby authorized shall be applied only to such improvements. Items included for engineering, inspection, and unforeseen contingencies shall not exceed 10 per cent of the total estimated cost of the work. If the Secretary of Agriculture approve the plans, specifications, and estimates, he shall notify the State highway department and immediately certify the fact to the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon set aside the share of the United States payable under this act on account of such project, which shall not exceed 50 per cent of the total estimated cost thereof, except that in any State in which the percentage of total land area to which the title of the United States is unqualified, or exempt under the Constitution of laws of the United States from taxation by or under the authority of such State exceeds 10 per cent of the total area of the land in the State, the Secretary of Agriculture shall reduce the ratio of cooperation on the part of the State the percentage that the area of the said land to which the United States has unqualified title, together with the land area so exempt from taxation in the State, is to the total area of all lands in the State. No payment of any money apportioned under this act shall be made on any project until such statement of the project, and the plans, specifications, and estimates thereof shall have been submitted to and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"When the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that any project so approved by him has been constructed in compliance with said plans and specifications he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of said State the amount set aside for said project: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, from time to time, make payments on said construction as the same progresses, but these payments, including previous payments, if any, shall not be more than the United States' pro rata part of the value of the labor and materials which have been actually put into said construction in conformity to said plans and specifications; nor shall any such payment be in excess of \$10,000 per mile, exclusive of the cost of bridges of more than 20 feet clear span. The construction work and labor in each State shall be done in accordance with its laws, and under the direct supervision of the State highway department, subject to the inspection and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, and in accordance with the rules and regulations made pursuant to this act.

"The Secretary of Agriculture and the State highway department of each State may jointly determine at what times, and in what amounts, payments, as work progresses, shall be made under this act. Such payments shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury, on warrants drawn by the Secretary of Agriculture, to such official or officials, or depository, as may be designated by the State highway department and authorized under the laws of the State to receive public funds of the State or county."

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I will explain my proposed amendment. I have simply repeated section 6 of the good roads act and have added one paragraph thereto. It would be confusing to listen to the reading of the proposed amendment without this explanation, because it would be difficult to follow it. As the amendment is written it only changes section 6 of the existing good road act in one paragraph and practically in one sentence. It became necessary, of course, to repeat the whole of section 6 of the existing law, so that the amendment, if it shall be adopted, might be plain when read in connection with the present law. Now, I will show Senators just wherein section 6 will be changed by the amendment if it be adopted.

Mr. SIMMONS. All the remainder of the section, as I understand the Senator, will be the same as provided in the present law?



Mr. PITTMAN. All the remainder will be exactly the same as the present section 6. I merely copied the section so as to have it all appear. I will read a part of section 6 as it exists, leading up to my amendment. It reads as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon set aside the share of the United States payable under this act on account of such project, which shall not exceed 50 per cent of the total estimated cost thereof.

That is the language of section 6 as it exists in the present good-roads law. My amendment is intended to modify that sentence. That sentence of the present good roads act limits the amount of United States funds that may be used upon any project to 50 per cent of the estimated cost of the project. There are certain States in which that is not fair, and, therefore, I have added the following language to section 6, which I will read:

Except that in any State in which the percentage of total land area to which the title of the United States is unqualified, or exempt under the Constitution or laws of the United States from taxation by or under the authority of such State exceeds 10 per cent of the total area of the land in the State, the Secretary of Agriculture shall reduce the ratio of cooperation on the part of the State the percentage that the area of the said land to which the United States has unqualified title, together with the land area so exempt from taxation in the State, is to the total area of all lands in the State.

That is the only change which it is proposed to make in the existing law.

The reason for it is this—and I will simply give an illustration which is common to the West: Under the good roads act the Legislature of the State of Nevada has laid out certain State highways. They consist of three great trans-State highways, which connect with the highways in Utah on the one side and California on the other side. The construction of those trans-State highways will be about all the State of Nevada can carry on. Those three highways constitute a link in the great transcontinental roads that are now being built throughout the West. For instance, one of them is the Lincoln Highway. The Lincoln Highway crosses the State of Nevada from one side to the other; it has never been kept up, and therefore the State of Nevada has adopted the Lincoln Highway as one of its State roads to be improved under the good-roads act. There is also the Overland Trail, which follows the Southern Pacific Railroad across the State from one side to the other, connecting in California and in Utah with similar roads. That road has been adopted by the State Legislature of the State of Nevada as one part of its State highway system. We have another road running diagonally through the State from its northeast corner to its southwest corner, connecting with the California road that leads to Los Angeles. These three roads are used by people traveling from the Atlantic to the Pacific in their automobiles; 90 per cent of the travel over these roads now is travel from outside States. Unless these links are kept in order, unless their condition is made equal to that of the other links in the great chains, the building of miles and miles of road in California and Utah and States east of Utah will be practically useless.

But, it may be asked, why the exception? This is the reason for it: Because the conditions in the State of Nevada constitute an exception as compared with the nonpublic-land States of the Union.

When the good-roads act was passed it was the intent, I believe, of Congress that the Government should put up half of the money and the States the other half of the money, but that was on the theory that all of the State property was subject to taxation in the State.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Can the Senator state what portion in area of the land in Nevada is held by the Federal Government and what its value is as compared with privately owned property?

Mr. PITTMAN. I will. Only 7 per cent of the total land area in the State of Nevada is subject to taxation by the State; over 86 per cent of the total land area in the State of Nevada is owned by the United States Government.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. Under those circumstances, under the Senator's amendment, what percentage of the money would the State of Nevada have to put up?

Mr. PITTMAN. The State of Nevada, it is estimated, would have to put up about 10 per cent.

Mr. KELLOGG. And the Federal Government 90 per cent?

Mr. PITTMAN. About 90 per cent. I have taken the State of Nevada as an example, because it is the extreme case; but the other Western States present similar conditions.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, before going to that subject, can the Senator answer the other part of my question,

which was as to the relative value of the property owned by the Federal Government and that in private ownership? I speak, of course, only of real estate.

Mr. PITTMAN. There is no doubt that the land that is in private ownership is more valuable; but as the Government land is not subject to taxation there never has been, to my knowledge, any attempt to assess its value. For instance, there are lands in forest reserves in the State of Nevada. That land has value; these forests have value; but, as I say, it never has been assessed, because it is not subject to taxation. It may have been assessed by some Government authority of which I do not know.

What I have stated with regard to the land title in Nevada is true of practically every Western State in varying degrees. For instance, in the State of Wyoming—I will take that for example—about 60 per cent of the land of that State, according to the hearings that I have here, is in Government ownership.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes.

Mr. REED. Is it or is it not the fact that almost all of the part which is still in Government ownership is mountainous or sterile land? In other words, are not the Government holdings that are not taken out left in that condition because the land is practically of no value? I do not know what the facts are. I am trying to get at them.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am glad the Senator asked that question. That is the general conception outside of the arid States. It is a very natural supposition. The fact that this land has not gone into private ownership would tend to prove that it is worthless.

As a matter of fact, it is not due to that at all. It is due to a lack of knowledge on the part of Congress of the conditions and of the laws necessary to make that land valuable. The western Senators have talked on the floor of the Senate for years with regard to that matter. Every time we have attempted any new legislation that would meet those conditions we have been opposed by very sincere eastern people, not because they knew anything against the legislation but because they feared that we were trying to grab land; that is all. The homestead act is inoperative as to that land. The homestead act, in fact, does not settle any land that requires irrigation to make it fertile and productive.

Under the irrigation projects that are going on in the West we have in Nevada placed under cultivation in the neighborhood of 200,000 acres of land, which is identical with 18,000,000 acres of land that we have left.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The conditions existing in Nevada are paralleled by the conditions existing in Oregon. If the Senator will permit me to give the figures, I will show just what the situation is in our State.

Mr. PITTMAN. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. In Oregon the area of the State is 61,188,480 acres, of which 36,802,621 acres, or approximately 60 per cent, are withheld or withdrawn from settlement and not subject to taxation. It is estimated that if these lands were subject to taxation they would bring to the State as revenue something like a million and a half of dollars. Now, I assume that the conditions in Nevada are somewhat the same as in Oregon with reference to the character of lands withdrawn.

Oregon with reference to the character of lands withdrawn; and if the Senator will permit me to state the situation just a little further, I will show just what these lands which are withdrawn consist of.

There are in national parks 159,360 acres; national monuments, 480 acres; Indian reservations, 1,275,114 acres; military reserves, 11,116 acres; forest reserves, 15,580,934 acres; power-site reserves, 261,910 acres; reservoir sites, 10,619 acres; coal reserves, 246,561 acres; Oregon-California land grant, 2,400,000 acres; public domain, 16,545,542 acres; State coal lands, which, of course, probably should not be taken into consideration, 541,000 acres; making a total of 36,802,621 acres of land which are absolutely withdrawn from taxation, and from which the State gets no revenue; neither do any of the counties of the State. So that there is very great merit in the contention of the Senator that this allowance ought to be made in any appropriations made under section 6 or under the original road act.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a further interruption?

Mr. PITTMAN. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. I am impressed with the fact that there is a good deal of force in the position taken by the Senator from Nevada, particularly as applied to these three great trunk roads, if I may call them such, which are to cross the State from east to west; but, as I understand, under this amendment—and I am not clear that I properly construe it—it would be possible under this legislation as adopted for any given county in any particular locality where most of the land was privately owned to have the same benefit, so far as the percentage was concerned, that the State would have if it were building these trunk lines. Now, it seems to me that where the conditions with regard to private ownership are substantially the same in Nevada as they are in our Eastern States, the percentage of Federal aid should be substantially the same in that State as it is in the Eastern States; but if it comes to localities in which the larger portion of the land is Federally owned—and I take it that is true along these three trunk lines that the Senator speaks of—then I can understand why the authorities should have much greater latitude. Do I properly construe the Senator's amendment?

Mr. PITTMAN. I understand the point that the Senator makes; but the situation is this: We will take, for instance, the Overland Trail. The Overland Trail goes through more of the settled country than the other two. It goes through five or six towns. Now, you may say that those five or six towns, having the property in private ownership, should not be excused from paying the full amount of the State's part. Well, they are not excused from paying the full amount of the State's part, because they are the only people that are taxed to pay the State's part.

For instance, 7 per cent of the property of the State is taxable; that is all. Now, whether the 7 per cent of land is on the road or not on the road, whether it is benefited by the road or not benefited by the road, it pays the total portion required of the State. So, when you get down to it it is unnecessary to try to equalize it as between counties or communities, because they pay it. They pay the full tax required of the State, no matter where they are, and under my amendment they will pay the full part. The only question is this: Instead of the State paying one-half, as it is doing now, they tax the people to pay one-tenth, because only one-tenth of the land of the State is subject to taxation. It is absolutely unfair to have the people of a State carry on these great national highways on behalf of a State when they are bearing ten times the burden that the people of any other State are bearing for exactly the same public service.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, of this 10 per cent of the State domain which is subject to taxation a very large portion is mineral, is it not?

Mr. PITTMAN. It is.

Mr. THOMAS. Is it not a fact that taxes upon mines constitute a transient source of revenue, and when the mine is depleted that source ceases, in consequence of which the portion of the domain which will yield a permanent revenue is actually less than 10 per cent?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; it is.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator to say that at the present time a thousand dollars' worth of real estate in Nevada bears ten times as much tax for public roads as a thousand dollars' worth of real estate would bear in a State that has no Government property?

Mr. PITTMAN. That is exactly the case. In other words, 10 men in Nevada have to bear the burden of 100 men, whereas 10 men in a State where all the land is privately owned bear the burden of 10 men.

I am not appealing for this purely and simply on behalf of my State. I am appealing on behalf of the good roads act. I know that the people of the States in which they have not the land to tax have reached the limit, and they are going to fall down on their part of the contribution to the good roads law unless Congress recognizes the equities of the case and treats them equitably.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I notice in an allotment sheet which was furnished me yesterday that there has been \$3,527,276.18 allotted to Nevada under the acts of 1916 and 1919. May I ask the Senator what portion of that allotment has been consumed by the State of Nevada?

Mr. PITTMAN. I can only speak from memory, but I think about a fourth of that has been exhausted.

Mr. POMERENE. Is that due to the fact that the State authorities have not been able to duplicate the amount which has already been provided by the Federal Government?

Mr. PITTMAN. It was due very largely to the limitation on taxation in the State.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I know what the Senator has related is true, not only of the State of Nevada, but it is a common thing in most of that part of the country. The wonder to me is, considering what they have already had to expend on their own roads, the enormous taxation they have placed on themselves for the protection of property of the Government itself, how they ever raised the amount the Senator says they did raise to meet the Government gratuity, if you please to call it such; how the State of Nevada was ever able to do it, with the taxation those people are compelled to carry now.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, if it were not for the fact that the people of the Western States are so anxious for good roads there would have been no contribution on the part of those Western States, where the majority of the land is not taxable. I thank the Senator from Arizona for calling that to the attention of the Senate.

Stop and think, Senators. The State of Nevada is 300 miles wide, approximately, and there are 3 great trunk lines being built from one border to the other, the benefit of which goes in the proportion of 90 to 10 to people living outside of that State. Those roads are being built as permanent highways. In places they are costing in the neighborhood of \$15,000 a mile, and the State of Nevada to-day is putting up nearly one-half of that, when the Government of the United States has a 90 per cent interest in the land. It would be a great misfortune if these States should be forced, by a constitutional or other limitation on taxation, to cease to participate with the Government in the building of these roads.

I heard it said yesterday by some one that this money was being extravagantly spent. I have the report of the highways commission of my State, and I have the report of the governor of my State. The only complaint that I read in those reports was that there were a great many annoying restrictions imposed by the Federal authorities, but in the end the reports stated that the careful supervision by the Federal authorities had resulted in the building of the best roads, and most economically, that had ever been built in the western country.

When you have two parties interested in the money that is being spent, you have a check which you have not when it is being expended under one party. I think the conception of the cooperation of the Federal Government with the States has worked splendidly. The roads are expensive roads, but they are carrying out the theory of Congress, and they are making those roads permanent.

There is just one other question to which I wish to refer. Remember that while the Federal Government assists the State government in the building of these roads, after the roads are built the obligation of the Federal Government ceases. And remember that then the obligation falls upon the State government to maintain those roads forever. The cost of the maintenance of these great State and interstate highways in course of time will be far greater than the initial cost. As a matter of fact, I think that the cost of maintenance for 10 years will be greater than the original cost.

Therefore the interests of this Government require that some equity be done in this particular case, and I therefore sincerely urge that this amendment be agreed to, and that it be agreed to while the legislatures of the Western States are in session, so that they may know that the Government will lift some of these unfair burdens from them and that they may be encouraged to go on with this work.

Congress has already recognized this necessity. The House of Representatives have passed a bill, called the Sells bill, which provides exactly the same remedy I provide by this amendment. That bill is now in the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator has said that this would reduce the proportion of the expense to be met by the States to about 10 per cent of the total in his own State. May I ask the Senator whether he has worked this out so as to give the Senate reasonably accurate information as to the proportion of the total expense which will have to be paid by the State authorities in the other States where there is a substantial amount of Federal-owned land?

Mr. PITTMAN. No; I have not worked that out; but I will now read the proportion of privately owned land, or taxable land, in the public-land States. For instance, in Arizona the taxable land is 45.4 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. What is that?

Mr. PITTMAN. Forty-five and four-tenths per cent of taxable land in Arizona. In California it is 78 per cent. In Colorado it is 84 per cent. In Idaho it is 80 per cent.

Mr. POMERENE. Taxable land?

Mr. PITTMAN. The taxable land. In Montana it is 87 per cent. In Nevada they have it 21 per cent. That is an error. The taxable land does not amount to that.



Mr. POMERENE. The State of Nevada has how much?

Mr. PITTMAN. It is simply an error in computation. The figures here show the error in computation.

Mr. SMOOT. Did the Senator say those figures showed the percentage of taxable lands?

Mr. PITTMAN. This is the ratio of patented land and national forests to total area; that is, the percentage.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator to say those were the percentages of taxable lands.

Mr. POMERENE. That is what I understood the statement to be.

Mr. PITTMAN. This is not all taxable. Part of it is taxable; that is, the patented land. That part of it is taxable, but they have included in the estimate "and national forests." The national forests are not taxable.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. They form half of some of the States.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am giving the Senator from Ohio the figures. That is the reason of the 21 per cent. They have added in the computation the patented lands, and with them the national forests, and the national forests are nontaxable lands. So the percentages I have read must be reduced. I have no other table at hand, so read the foregoing to give the Senator an idea of the approximate percentages.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if, in his judgment, those percentages to which he has been referring represent the entire equities of those States?

It is apparent to all of us who live in such States that where you have a large body of unentered public land, that means that there have been thousands and millions of acres entered, and perhaps patented, but which have a very low valuation. You must build these roads through the country where the lands have but small value, and if you are going to have permanent roads through that country, the Government must come to the aid of the country in a very much greater degree than is proposed by any legislation submitted to the Senate.

Take the State of New Mexico, 350 miles wide and 400 miles long, with a population of about 300,000, and, while there is a large percentage of the lands in that State not subject to taxation, the lands which are subject to taxation are of small value, compared with the lands in the older States of the Union, and it seems to me that if you are going to get permanent highways through that country, you will have to go even further than the amendment suggested by the Senator from Nevada would go.

The thought has been expressed here that these roads are not permanent roads in the sense we have permanent roads in this section of the country. That is true, and necessarily true. I would ask the Senate to consider for a moment what it would cost to build a concrete road through the State of New Mexico, which is 350 miles wide. There are projected through that State, as through the State of Nevada, at least three great interstate highways. To talk about building those roads of concrete, or of permanent construction, such as we understand by that term in this section of the country, is entirely out of the question, unless the Federal Government should go very much further than it is proposed it shall go. I submit that Senators should consider that when you talk about the mere percentage of lands remaining in Government ownership, you have not even commenced to tell the story, have not even commenced to present the situation that actually exists there, because if you have this great area of country, which is comprised of lands valued at only two, three, four, or five dollars per acre, and undertake to consider that situation as equivalent to the situation which you have in this section of the country, where values go up to forty or fifty or one hundred dollars an acre, you can not put the two situations in the same parallel. There is no comparison between them, and instead of going to the length suggested in the amendment of the Senator from Nevada, I submit that the Government should make the appropriations in those States of this money, and simply impose upon the States the burden of keeping the roads in repair.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I want it borne in mind that this amendment does not place any greater burden on the Federal Government than it now bears. It does not change the allotments to the States at all. There is going to be no more money allotted to the Western States under this amendment. It does not change the allotments at all.

The allotment is based on certain principles. The State of Nevada will get out of this fund, we will say, \$6,000,000. It is all going to be spent in that State under the good roads act. The question is whether they shall spend 90 per cent on one road or 50 per cent on one road; that is all. We say that

in the State of Nevada, where only one-tenth of the property is taxable, that they ought to spend 90 per cent on one road and the State 10 per cent on the same road; that is all.

I do not desire to have anyone get the impression that the amendment which I have proposed in any way places any greater burden on the Federal Government, because it does not. It does not add a dollar to the appropriation. It simply gives the Secretary of Agriculture the power to use that money to complete a road when the completion of the road is necessary and the State is unable to pay 50 per cent of the cost of that particular road. It is to the interest of the Federal Government that the authority be given to the Secretary of Agriculture, so that the great trans-State highways, that are an essential link in the highways across the entire country, can be completed, and completed expeditiously, with the money that Congress has already appropriated for that purpose, and not have to wait until the State, under its constitution, can raise its share of the money.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a suggestion?

Mr. PITTMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am strongly sympathetic with the equities of all that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] has suggested, but in the future I see very great difficulty in those States maintaining those highways for long periods of time, commencing at an early date in all probability. In the case of the State of Nevada paying 10 per cent and the Government 90 per cent, the only opportunity for those overtaxed people is in the securing of that reduction from 50 per cent to 10 per cent, to enable them to exercise for their own purposes the right of taxation for roads that are essential to the State, but for which the Government itself does not see any propriety in making an appropriation. In other words, we reserve to those people the power to tax themselves to build the essential roads that the Government will not enter into. If we forced them to pay 50 per cent, they would not be able to raise one dollar to carry out any scheme for a county road in the whole State. It seems to me that it is as little as Congress can do to allow the Government to pay its fair proportion of those expenses; otherwise, agreeing with the Senator, it simply kills forever any hope of further road building in the Western States.

Mr. PITTMAN. I might call attention to the fact that it happens that in the public-land States the roads which are being built under the supervision of the Government are more in accord with the intention of Congress than the roads built in any other part of the country. The Lincoln Highway that passes through 8 or 10 of the Western States, the highway that goes through the southern part of Colorado and into New Mexico and Arizona, the Arrowhead Trail that passes through Salt Lake City, Utah, and the highway that passes north through Montana are four great highways that cross nearly all of the public-land States, and in every State they cross they are being improved under the good roads act, while on the other hand it is charged, and it may or may not be true, that in the thickly populated States of the East there is no such general system worked out, and the roads are more of a convenience for use in driving or riding from a settlement to a railroad.

If any good is going to be accomplished under the road act, and I know that it is being accomplished, no greater good can be accomplished than the expeditious building of these great transcontinental roads. It seems to me foolish for the Federal Government to wait 10 years to have those roads built, by reason of the delay on the part of the States to put up 50 per cent of the money, when the money is appropriated by Congress and ready to put into the roads. It simply means that if the Federal Government put the whole appropriation now into the three roads without the assistance of the States, that it ceases to cooperate with the States just that much more quickly, and after that time, if there are any roads built in a State, they have to be built solely at the expense of the State.

It is not an appropriation we are asking at all. We are asking that the Secretary of Agriculture be given authority to put up the necessary money when a State can not afford to do it, and when the State can not do it by reason of not having sufficient taxable property in the State.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] made the statement that the State of South Carolina had discontinued or was considering discontinuing State aid in the building of public roads. In view of that statement I wired to South Carolina, and I have received two telegrams in reply which I desire to have read by the Secretary in order that they may appear in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERMAN in the chair). Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

CHARLESTON, S. C., February 18, 1921.

Senator N. B. DIAL,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Wiring you day letter protesting against Senator KENYON's statement and action. South Carolina Legislature urged passage of Federal aid act, and State highway commission has in sight several times amount necessary to match Federal aid.

R. GOODWYN RHETT,  
Chairman State Highway Commission.

COLUMBIA, S. C., February 18, 1921.

Senator N. B. DIAL,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Statement that South Carolina has ceased to appropriate funds to meet Federal aid for roads erroneous. We will have much more money for permanent road building than is necessary to comply with Federal act. Do not understand how Senator KENYON got his information.

R. A. COOPER, Governor.

The day letter referred to was subsequently ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTON, S. C., 11.30 a. m.—18.

Senator NATHANIEL B. DIAL,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I have just sent Senator KENYON the following telegram:

"Your motion to exclude South Carolina from participation in Federal aid funds is obviously based upon misapprehension facts. Our legislature almost unanimously requested passage of this Federal aid act; that applications are already with this department covering with State funds all Federal aid funds thus far provided for South Carolina, and she is prepared to cover promptly all appropriations which could come to her under that act. Moreover, she is now calling for bids on costly bridges over the Pee Dee, Santee, Wateree, and middle Savannah Rivers, and is in need of these funds, amongst other things, for a bridge over the lower Savannah River, and all such bridge projects on this coast are important for national defense. The last two legislatures authorized bond issues and made appropriations for over \$20,000,000 for road building in this State. We may be late in starting, but before this fund is expended we will be glad to challenge Iowa to a comparison of highways."

Can not imagine foundation for KENYON's statement unless it was proposal of House to repeal 2-mill tax. This would have no bearing whatever upon the State's ability to match Federal funds. The counties already have been authorized to issue bonds far in excess of amount necessary to match Federal funds, and are earnestly calling upon us for it from every direction. The 2-mill tax would aggregate less than \$1,000,000. There are bond issues already authorized for work on State highways aggregating over \$15,000,000.

R. GOODWYN RHETT,  
Chairman State Highway Commission for South Carolina.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, the subject of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] has had my consideration for some time. Indeed, a bill which I drew more than a year and a half ago, and before any of the Senators from the public-land States had even called my attention to it, contained a provision which I hoped to incorporate in any measure which might be enacted upon the subject.

I am in hearty sympathy with the proper recognition of the public-land States along the lines suggested by the Senator from Nevada. I, in fact, would go further than even he proposes in reference to the roads built through the public domain. But here is the situation which the Senator hopes to obviate through his motion to suspend the rules: He proposes, when no additional appropriation has been granted but has been denied, to amend the present arrangement which has been entered into, even the contracts which have been entered into between the Federal Government through its highway department and the State departments, and even with contractors, to build the roads under the present law.

The proposition has been considered by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the Senate, and a bill is now on the calendar which I think is more definite and clear than the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada. The reason that bill has not been pressed has been that the House of Representatives, as we know, has divided the powers of the former Post Office and Post Roads Committee in reference to appropriations. The power to appropriate has been taken away from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and conferred on the Committee on Appropriations. Now, naturally the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads insist that the legislative power shall still rest with it. The amendment could not be adopted under the rules of the House because the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will insist on carrying it to that committee.

I wish to say to the Senator from Nevada, in furtherance of the statement as to my attitude on the question and my interest in it as demonstrated by amendments or bills before the Senate, that when the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the Senate take up the question at the very beginning of the next session this proposition will be included, because I have found but very little objection to it. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] did not quite understand it, and was rather opposed to it; but I think when anyone understands the proposition he will see that special arrangements should be made for the benefit of the public-land States in regard to the

distribution of the money which goes to that State. I am not clear but that there should be a different method of appropriation even to the public-land States. I am not clear that the proposed amendment, or even the one that has been proposed by the Senate committee, would mete out exact justice to the public-land States. It is a question which should be given careful consideration at a very early date. We can not frame this law on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will yield in just a moment. We can not frame this provision on the floor of the Senate with all the obstacles which may be presented, but we propose to remedy that defect; and if the proposition carrying an appropriation of \$100,000,000 had been carried, I had an amendment prepared to propose to it covering the very subject which the Senator from Nevada has proposed.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I suppose the Senator refers to Senate bill 4899?

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Phipps bill.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes; the Phipps bill. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether there has been serious objection on the part of anyone in the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to incorporating that bill as an amendment to the pending appropriation bill?

Mr. TOWNSEND. There is very serious objection. When we start to amend the present law, it ought to be considered in all its relations. It ought to be considered by the right committee. Here is an appropriation bill that is proposed by the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives. The amendment and the proposition should be considered by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House. Then we can consider it in our committee and submit it to conference with the hope that it may be accepted. We can not do it in the manner proposed here.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I assume that legislation, such as that suggested in the so-called Phipps bill, will meet with the approval of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the Senate and that they will favorably report it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. We have already reported it out.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. When it goes to the House, if it should go there as a part of the pending appropriation bill now before the Senate, I do not think there is any reason why we should assume that the Appropriations Committee of the House would insist on cutting it out.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; but I suppose that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House would do so. They have already given notice that they would do it, and that it must be considered by them.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If they should assume that responsibility, it seems to me we still shall have performed our duty if we do the thing which the Senate thinks should be done.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not care to imperil the proposed legislation. I should dislike to have the amendment rejected, because I know the principle is right. I think we shall make no progress by trying to put the proposition on as an amendment to the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. May I inquire of the Senator how we could possibly lose any ground by putting it on the bill?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Supposing it is stricken out in the other House or they refuse to let the appropriation bill be considered as they may do under their rules. They can instruct their conferees in reference to this matter, and they must do so.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then we shall be in no worse position than we now are.

Mr. TOWNSEND. We shall be in a worse position in this respect: I would be in the position as the chairman of the committee of consenting to legislation of this kind which should be considered in conjunction with another specific bill or as an amendment to the roads bill.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It seems to me that we are confronted with just this situation: Here is a matter about which the Senate appears to be in entire agreement. The Post Office Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and everybody whose voice has been raised in connection with the subject seem to be in entire agreement.

Mr. TOWNSEND. There have been a number of questions as to which that is true, but they would not be in order on an appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I understand it is not in order, but the Senate has a right to make it in order by a suspension of the rule.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Of course, if two-thirds of the Senate wish to do it, I shall abide by their decision.



Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The so-called Phipps bill embodies precisely the idea which is proposed in the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and it contains an additional suggestion, a new section which was inserted by the committee, which I think is a very appropriate one. If we can, under a suspension of the rule, get before the Senate the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada, then we may take it up and substitute the bill which has been reported by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads for the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is true, but, as I have stated, I do not think that is in order, or that the question of extending the use of the unexpended balance already appropriated for good roads should be considered in connection with the pending bill. If we do not pass appropriate legislation early in the special session, the appropriation can be extended by joint resolution of the two Houses without any question at all.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I desire to state to the distinguished chairman of the committee that the State of New Mexico to-day has just about reached its limit, and in order to raise any more funds with which to meet even the funds which are proposed to be expended on the part of the Government it will be necessary in that State to have a State-wide election. That can not be had until the general election of next year. We have practically got to amend the constitution of the State in order to meet this requirement, owing to the limitation upon the rate of taxation. I am sure that it would be in the interest of the very legislation which we all approve if the so-called Phipps bill could be considered now and help out that situation and let the work go on to a greater extent than it has been going on. Inasmuch as the proposed amendment is satisfactory to everybody, I must confess that I am unable to see the force of the argument that because the other House might not be willing to give the matter consideration on account of parliamentary reasons we ourselves should decline to take action.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am not admitting that everybody is satisfied with this proposition, for there have been many questions asked and many doubts expressed in reference to it. I think it is right and I think we can carry it; when the proposition is submitted on its merits, I have not any doubt what will be done with it; but I am opposed at this time to framing legislation on an appropriation bill on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, I hope we may have a vote on the proposition to suspend the rule, in order that we may determine whether or not two-thirds of the Senate wish to attach the legislation to the pending bill. If no other Senator wishes to speak, I will ask for a quorum.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a few words, addressing myself in particular to the chairman of the committee. I do not desire to delay the passage of the bill, but I am unable to perceive any reason for delaying an exigent matter, such as this, on the pretense or, rather, the ground, for I would not use the word "pretense" in connection with anything suggested by the Senator from Michigan, that the legislation may fail in the other House, or on the ground of our opposition to legislation on appropriation bills. That is hardly an appropriate basis for contesting the amendment, in view of the exigent condition of that section of the country for which the plea for action is now made.

It is impossible for a number of the Western States to raise their fifty-fifty proportion of money for the building of good roads. They are burdened almost to the extent of bankruptcy to-day. My State is as large as Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and a part of Pennsylvania. Under those circumstances it is preposterous to talk about the people of my State, with a population of 350,000, building roads for 300 miles in different directions and putting up the money on a fifty-fifty basis with the Government, with the Government laying out the roads, with an absolute inhibition against the State making a selection as to where they themselves wish to spend the money.

Senators, I wish to say that delay in the enactment of the legislation proposed is going to make a wreck of public-road building in the Western States. We can relieve the situation right now by the chairman of the committee consenting to let the amendment go on the bill and do the best he can in conference. There would be no objection on the part of any of the friends of the measure—and none of us is more ardently in favor of it than is the chairman—if the chairman should let the amendment go on and it should be stricken out. We would realize that our conferees could not secure its retention, but at least we would know that we had the backing of the Senate behind any further attempted legislation in the same direction.

As I said in the beginning, it seems to me that it is hardly an adequate answer to the proposition to cite the objection which we all have to legislation on appropriation bills, for no longer than the other day the Senate set aside its rule by a two-thirds vote in order that there might be legislation on an appropriation bill. I voted for the suspension of the rule; I do not know how the chairman voted, but it is essential for the Senate at times, especially under the peculiar conditions of which the Senator from Michigan speaks, which now obtain in the House of Representatives, for the Senate to act as it best may to bring before the other House under its changed rules the sense of the Senate on important questions such as this.

I can not do more than appeal to the Senate to allow the amendment to go into the bill, for I know as well as I know I am standing here the absolute ruin that will ensue to certain States in the West in connection with the road-building program unless such action is taken.

The magnificent impetus that has been given to the building of roads in the various States through Federal aid is a source of congratulation to all the people. More roads of the proper kind have been built in the last 10 years in the United States than in any previous 50 years in our history. All that has been done by means of the little encouragement that has been accorded to the States. They, as a matter of fact, are putting up five or six times more than the Government, but in this instance we are dealing with States which can not put up any more. One county of my State has taxed itself \$4,000,000 for the purpose of building roads. The population of New Mexico is scattered over a section, as I have indicated, as large as the New England States. Suppose the people of New England started to build a road from Maine to Rhode Island; it would run through a thickly populated section and would involve a great distance, but even such a road would be less in extent than a road from the border line of Arizona on the east to the border line of California on the west. Yet through the section of New England many rich people live, whereas in New Mexico the population is scattered, and, outside of isolated communities, there is very little wealth.

Furthermore, fully 90 per cent of that great State is comprised in public lands on which settlement can not be made under the laws now pertaining to those lands or else it is held in Indian reservations, military reservations, forest reservations, and national parks. The lands so held in Government reservations include 75 per cent of the best lands in the State. So the people there stand absolutely helpless. The Government ought to build the roads itself and put on us only the burden of maintaining them, and even that would be a burden greater by two to one than any of the Eastern States will bear because of their contributions toward the construction and preservation of the roads.

Mr. President, I am sorry to disagree with the chairman of the committee. I rarely disagree with anything that my friend, the Senator from Michigan, suggests, but I should like to appeal to him to allow this matter to be presented to the House of Representatives in connection with this bill. If there shall be any objection in the House because of the fact that it has already reported favorably a bill for a similar purpose and with the same intent, if the House says, "This is not the way we like to legislate," no one on this side will criticize the conferees on the part of the Senate for not keeping the item in the bill.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAY in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gay	La Follette	Smith, S. C.
Ball	Gerry	Lenroot	Smoot
Beckham	Glass	Lodge	Spencer
Borah	Gooding	McCumber	Stanley
Brandegee	Gronna	McKellar	Sutherland
Caldor	Hale	McNary	Thomas
Capper	Harris	Moses	Townsend
Chamberlain	Harrison	Myers	Trammell
Colt	Heflin	Nelson	Underwood
Curtis	Hitchcock	New	Wadsworth
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Kellogg	Pittman	Warren
Elkins	Kendrick	Poland	Williams
Fall	Kenyon	Pomeroy	Willis
Fernald	Kirby	Ransdell	Wolcott
Fletcher	Knox	Sheppard	
Frelinghuysen		Simmons	
		Smith, Ariz.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr.

PITTMAN] to suspend the rule in order to make in order the amendment that he has offered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I am unable for the moment to get a transfer of my pair, and withhold my vote.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before relative to my pair, I vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], who is absent. I, therefore, withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Has the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). That Senator has not voted.

Mr. THOMAS. I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I shall vote, and I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut, which I transfer to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Has the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have a general pair with that Senator, and, not knowing how he would vote, in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I observe that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has not answered to his name. Having a pair with him, I am compelled to withdraw my vote.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], who is out of the Chamber and has announced the pair. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. EDGE. I have a pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. Not being able to secure a transfer, I will withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD. I have a pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I inquire whether the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (after having voted in the affirmative). I ask if the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. WARREN. Then I will withdraw my vote, because I have a pair with that Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington (after having voted in the negative). Has the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. JONES of Washington. He is necessarily absent from the Chamber on business of the Senate, and I have agreed to take care of him during these absences. Therefore I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call resulted—yeas 33, nays 31, as follows:

## YEAS—33.

Ashurst	Gooding	McKellar	Stanley
Beckham	Harris	McNary	Trammell
Borah	Harrison	Myers	Underwood
Chamberlain	Heflin	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Henderson	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	Hitchcock	Ransdell	Williams
Fletcher	Jones, N. Mex.	Sheppard	
Gay	Kendrick	Simmons	
Gerry	Kirby	Smith, Ariz.	

## NAYS—31.

Ball	France	La Follette	Smoot
Brandagee	Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Spencer
Calder	Gronna	Lodge	Sutherland
Capper	Hale	Moses	Townsend
Colt	Kellogg	Nelson	Wadsworth
Curtis	Kenyon	New	Willis
Elkins	Keyes	Phipps	Wolcott
Fernald	Knox	Polindexter	

## NOT VOTING—32.

Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Smith, Ga.
Cummins	King	Page	Smith, Md.
Dillingham	McCormick	Penrose	Smith, S. C.
Edge	McCumber	Pomerene	Sterling
Glass	McLean	Reed	Swanson
Gore	Newberry	Robinson	Thomas
Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Sherman	Warren
Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Shields	Watson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI, the yeas are 33, the nays are 31. Two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, a little while ago, when the Senate was considering the motion to suspend the rule to make in order the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], in the course of the debate the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, made the statement that large sums of this Federal aid for road construction had been wasted, and that there was no question about it. I was surprised to hear the chairman of that committee make that statement, and I did not want it to go unchallenged. I had never heard the charge made before, so I questioned the statement. Being one who did not agree with the statement, I did not want it to appear in the Record that all Senators present agreed to the proposition that a large amount of that money has been wasted. So I called up the Bureau of Roads in the Agricultural Department; I talked with the chief of that bureau, Mr. McDonald, and he said that no complaint of money wasted, as suggested by the Senator from Michigan, had ever come to him. It was my impression that this money had been honestly handled that caused me to challenge the statement of the Senator from Michigan. I should not wonder that some money, in carrying out a great program of this character, might be unwisely spent and there might be some waste; but the statement that a large amount of this good-roads fund had been wasted was news to me, and I could not agree to that statement of the Senator.

In all these road projects, Mr. President, the State must co-operate with the Federal Government. The road must be designated by both the State and Federal Governments. The road authorities in the State must pass upon it; the road authorities of the Federal Government must pass upon it; and then they co-operate in working out the proposition of building the road; and in all the work that has been done in this country I have never heard the charge of graft connected with it, not the graft of a single dollar; and I want to say, Mr. President, for those who have had charge of the construction of the highways of this country, that they are entitled to be complimented; they are entitled to have words of praise expressed about them, because in all this great work there has been no charge of graft whatever. Mark you, they have handled millions and hundreds of millions of dollars, and I say their splendid conduct is entitled to words of commendation and praise at the hands of the Senate. Knowing something about this great road work, having been an advocate of good-roads construction ever since I have been in Congress, I was surprised when the Senator from Michigan made the statement he did this morning, and I wanted to enter my protest against that statement. As I said before, I have talked with the chief of the Bureau of Roads upon the subject, and I am sure that the Senator from Michigan is mistaken in what he had to say about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I was asked by a number of rural carriers in my State to offer an amendment to this bill providing for an equipment cost. I have not offered the amendment, and the reason is that a majority of the committee was of the opinion that no postal legislation should be placed upon this bill at all, except in one or two minor particulars, to which it is unnecessary for me to refer now.

The Rural Delivery Service in the United States is about 23 years old. It was begun largely through the efforts of the Hon. Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, then a Member of the House of Representatives and now a Senator-elect, when the experiment was first made. Its evolution and success have been remarkable. It is now a vital and inseparable part of the greatest postal system in the world. It serves approximately 30,000,000 people, or nearly one-third of our entire population. It gives to the



great majority of our rural population daily mail. It gives them an intimate contact with the outside world. It gives them their mail at their front gates. It gives them the daily newspapers. With the introduction of the parcel-post as a part of the system, it allows the residents of rural communities to buy directly from the cities, when they so desire and when it is to their interest to do so. It also gives them the opportunity of selling many of the products of the farm directly to city buyers, thus being an enormous advantage to both producer and consumer.

It facilitates an exchange of commodities at nominal cost. Its convenience to the rural public knows no bounds. Its educational value in the way of supplying educational reading matter of all kinds can not be overestimated. Its importance and value to the rural resident in the way of adding to his comfort, to his success, to his happiness, to his learning, and to his material benefit can not be doubted.

The Rural Delivery Service is the forerunner of good roads. As soon as a mail route is established over a road, the very next step is to improve the road. It was only under the constitutional authority to establish post roads that the Federal Government was ever induced to lend its aid to road building, an aid that has probably done more to secure the building of good roads in this country than any other one fact, not even excepting the fact of automobiles. When we remember that the marvelous way in which roads build up a country and the enormous saving in the cost of transportation by reason of having good roads, we can only then fully understand the importance of this aspect of the rural mail service.

Again, Mr. President, our Nation is confronted with the vital question as to how more of our boys and girls can be kept on the farm. For the past generation they have been flocking to the cities. The census of 1920 shows that a majority of our entire population now resides in the cities, for the first time in our history. In my own State of Tennessee, 36 of 95 counties in the State have lost in population, while only 11 increased over 5 per cent. Everyone realizes that this is not a good condition. We must improve it. We must make country life more endurable. We must make it more attractive. We must improve and build up the rural-delivery service, the parcel post, continue to secure better roads, better banking facilities for the farmers, so that they can improve their farms, build better homes and improve their lands, give their children better schools and schoolhouses, continue to teach them the most improved methods of farming, and the time is here when more attention should be given to rural recreation and amusement.

Having these things in view, Mr. President, we should take no backward step on the subject of Rural Free Delivery Service. We should pay the rural carriers in the same way that we pay for city and interstate service. For the Railway Mail Service we have up-to-date mail cars and equipment. In addition, railway mail clerks receive an allowance of \$2 per day for meals while away from home on duty. Employees of the City Delivery Service are provided with everything necessary for the performance of their duty and this is right. They are furnished with car fare for transportation to and from their posts of duty. Mounted city carriers and collectors have vehicles furnished which the Government provides at an expense that has been estimated to be from \$1,000 to \$1,800. The pay of these men in the City Delivery Service is just about the same as the rural carriers receive, but the rural carriers are discriminated against in that they receive no equipment. They have to furnish their own horses and vehicles or automobiles, and must keep them at their own expense. The salary of a rural carrier on a standard route of 24 miles is \$1,800 per year. Out of this salary the rural carrier is obliged to provide and maintain the equipment necessary to perform the services required. The result is that probably more than one-third of the carrier's salary is paid out for equipment and the cost of maintaining the same. The consequence is that the rural carrier much prefers to get a place in the same service in the city, and often does, and hence one of the reasons for the trekking from the country to the city.

Mr. President, the rural carrier is not asking for more salary. He is satisfied with the salary that the recent commission on readjustment of salaries gave him, but he does ask that he be granted a reasonable sum to assist in defraying the expenses of maintaining the equipment used in the performance of his duty, to be paid as a separate allowance apart from the said salary, as substantially is given to the city carrier, and in this request, it seems to me, that he is clearly within the bounds of reason. Of course, Mr. President, I know that on an appropriation bill that this provision can not be placed, as it is legislation, and our committee has decided that legislation of this kind shall not be placed on this appropriation bill. If it were per-

missible, under our rule, I should offer an amendment giving to the rural carrier this allowance. For the reasons I have given, I think it but fair and just, and at the first opportunity I shall avail myself of the privilege to offer, by way of bill or amendment, such a provision to be enacted into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. TOWNSEND, Mr. MOSES, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. BECKHAM, and Mr. HENDERSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 14461, which is known as the immigration bill, so as to make it the unfinished business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 14461) to provide for the protection of the citizens of the United States by the temporary suspension of immigration, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert a substitute.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, the immigration bill, may be temporarily laid aside so that I may call up the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 15872) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the formal reading be dispensed with, and that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be considered first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that course will be followed.

#### MEMORIAL TO THE DEAD OF THE FIRST DIVISION.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, there is on the calendar a joint resolution of six or eight lines providing for the erection of a memorial statue to the dead of the First Division of the American Expeditionary Forces in the late war, and I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to yield to me for a moment to have it considered.

Mr. LODGE. I will yield gladly, if it does not give rise to debate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If it gives rise to any debate at all, I will withdraw it. It is the unanimous report of the Committee on the Library.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 226) authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Division, American Expeditionary Forces, in the World War, which was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to grant the Memorial Association of the First Division, United States Army, permission to erect, on public grounds of the United States in the city of Washington, D. C., south of the State, War, and Navy Building, and east of the Corcoran Art Gallery, a monument to the dead of the First Division, American Expeditionary Forces, in the World War: Provided, That the site chosen and the design of the monument and pedestal shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts.*

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I will say, in explanation of the joint resolution, that it will cost the Government nothing. The Commission of Fine Arts have made a report upon the project. The site is subject to the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts, and of course the selection of the monument is subject to their approval. I hope there will be no objection to the joint resolution, and I ask that the letter from the Commission

of Fine Arts and the argument which was submitted to the Committee on the Library in favor of the passage of the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD in connection with it.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,  
1729 New York Avenue, Washington, January 13, 1921.

MY DEAR SENATOR BRANDEGEE: Replying to your letter of January 8; requesting from the Commission of Fine Arts a report to the Library Committee of the Senate on Joint Resolution 226 entitled "A joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Division, American Expeditionary Forces, in the World War," I have the honor to inform you that the Commission of Fine Arts has examined the possible sites in the District of Columbia for such a memorial, and has taken into consideration the fund available for the payment thereof. The commission favors a site south of the State, War, and Navy Building and north of B Street, the exact point to be located when the design of the monument shall be established. If Congress shall determine upon this site the design of the monument will have to be considered with reference to the treatment plan for this area and the semipublic buildings which line Seventeenth Street opposite the location. By giving careful study to these elements of the problem, together with the design of the monument itself, a fitting and harmonious result can be achieved.

Sincerely, yours,

CHARLES MOORE, Chairman.

HON. FRANK B. BRANDEGEE,  
United States Senate.

Argument presented with a joint resolution for the erection of a monument to the dead of the First Division, American Expeditionary Forces, in the World War.

When the United States entered the World War, the small Regular Army was employed largely along the Mexican border. It became necessary to organize and dispatch, as promptly as possible, an expeditionary force to France. Gen. Pershing personally selected from the troops that were under his command in Texas, the regiments and corresponding units that eventually composed the First Division, American Expeditionary Forces. Embarkation began at Hoboken on June 13, 1917, and by the middle of September all of the division was assembled in the training areas in Lorraine and Alsace, near the battle lines and within sound of the enemy's guns.

In October and November, 1917, the different elements spent periods of 10 days each in the Somervillier sector, where they completed their training by sharing with the French troops the defense of the sector. Here they were subjected to violent raids and bombardments and they suffered their first casualties. The bodies of the first men to fall were buried at Bathlemon, where the people of Lorraine have erected in loving memory a monument bearing the Cross of Lorraine and an inscription that will for all time tell the passerby of these first sacrifices of the American Army in the cause of humanity.

After a further period of training for open warfare, during the rigorous winter of 1917-18, the First Division entered the battle line in Lorraine, north of Toul, in the middle of January, 1918, where it took over a defensive sector. Here it sustained its position and became the object of particularly vicious raids and gas and shell bombardments by the enemy. Its losses, and the dangers and hardships, developed the troops into veterans.

When, therefore, the great German offensive began on March 21, 1918, and the commander in chief placed his forces at the disposal of the Allied High Command, the First Division was dispatched to Picardy to help stem the enemy's progress on that front. The division entered the Cantigny sector, relieving two French divisions, and became engaged in almost continual battle. Among its achievements was the assault and capture of the town of Cantigny and the enemy's position over a front of 2,000 yards and a depth of 1,200 yards. This first American offensive came at a psychological moment and produced a marked effect on friend and foe by showing that the American soldier was at least the equal of the veteran troops of Europe.

On July 9 the division was relieved by two French divisions, and on July 12 it began a series of forced night marches to the northwest of Paris. On July 18 the division attacked as the left division of the Twentieth French Corps, which formed the spear-head of the allied offensive southwest of Soissons. For five days and nights it fought desperately, overcoming the enemy's selected troops at this point. It advanced more than nine kilometers and contributed in a determining degree to the withdrawal of the enemy from the south bank of the Marne and to compelling him to begin that retreat which ended only with the armistice. Here the division remained longer in battle without reinforcements than any other in the Tenth French Army. It suffered losses amounting to 50 per cent of its combat troops.

From the battlefields of Soissons the division proceeded again to Lorraine, where it took over a defensive sector. On September 12 it attacked in the St. Mihiel offensive as the left division of the southern line, thus occupying a critical post in the operation. It took all objectives on schedule time, and continued the advance until it met the Twenty-sixth Division from the north, early on the morning of September 13.

On September 30, after arduous night marches across the rear of the First American Army, it entered a critical point of the line in the great battle of the Meuse-Argonne. Here it fought desperately for 11 days, overcoming the enemy's determined resistance and suffering losses which again amounted to more than half of the troops engaged. It conquered a series of strong positions, and the effect of its successes contributed greatly to the enemy's withdrawal. For its brilliant performance the commander in chief gave it the only individual citation issued from the headquarters of the American Expeditionary Forces.

In spite of its hardships and losses, the First Division took its place as reserve of the Fifth Army Corps for the decisive assault of November 1. On November 5 it entered the line and advanced to the Meuse River at Mouzon. That night it pressed its advantage in the direction of Sedan, and the morning of November 7 found its regiments on the hills across the river from that fortress. From here it was withdrawn for another operation that was being prepared by the Second American Army.

The division entered Germany with the army of occupation and occupied a sector of the Coblenz Bridgehead. Just as it was the first to go, so it was the last to return, and it reached New York on September 6, 1919.

During the division's campaigns and battles its losses amounted to 249 officers and 5,040 enlisted men killed in action or died of wounds, and 641 officers and 19,690 enlisted men wounded in action.

Before leaving Germany the division secured funds from private sources and erected five monuments on the principal battlefields bearing in bronze the names of all who fell on each field. Immediately upon returning to the United States the First Division Memorial Association began to raise funds for the erection of a worthy monument in the city of Washington which should bear in honor the names of those who gave their lives in its ranks, and which should preserve forever their spirit of courage and sacrifice as an inspiration to our people. At present the fund amounts to \$120,000, and it is intended to increase the sum to \$150,000. It is proposed to secure a suitable design, which will not only fulfill the purpose desired but which will be an ornament to the National Capital.

After considering many sites, the one selected has been chosen for the following reasons:

(a) Its location adjacent to the State, War, and Navy Building appears to be peculiarly appropriate.

(b) The White House grounds on one side and the Corcoran Art Gallery on the other guarantee the dignity of that section of the city.

(c) The park and the surrounding open spaces incident to it insure against the construction of large buildings which might dwarf the monument.

(d) Its location near a portion of Seventeenth Street, which has been dedicated to the beautiful edifices already constructed, insures the future preservation of the beauty of that portion of the city.

(e) The immediate site itself independent of its general advantages is admirably adapted to the approach to the monument.

The First Division has earned the gratitude of the American people and of the American Government, and it is fitting that it should receive the consideration that is requested in the attached joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15872), making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Secretary will read the bill for action on the committee amendments.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations was, on page 2, line 4, before the name "Spain," to strike out "and," and after the name "Spain," to insert "and Turkey," and in line 5, after the word "each," to strike out "\$210,000" and insert "\$227,500," so as to read:

#### SALARIES OF AMBASSADORS AND MINISTERS.

Ambassadors extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Spain, and Turkey, at \$17,500 each, \$227,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 16, to strike out:

For ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Turkey, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 25, to increase the total appropriation for salaries of ambassadors, ministers, etc., from "\$576,000" to "\$588,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 11, to strike out "\$354,000" and insert "\$404,000," so as to read:

For salaries of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, as provided in the act of February 5, 1915, entitled "An act for the improvement of the foreign service," as amended by the act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, approved July 1, 1916, and the act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, approved June 4, 1920, \$404,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 18, to increase the total for salaries of secretaries, etc., in the Diplomatic Service, from "\$378,600" to "\$428,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 6, to increase the appropriation for employment of necessary clerks at the embassies and legations from "\$300,000" to "\$480,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 8, to insert:

#### SALARIES, INTERPRETERS TO EMBASSIES AND LEGATIONS.

Interpreter to legation and consulate general to Persia, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 11, to insert: Interpreter to legation and consulate general to Bangkok, Siam, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 13, to insert:

For 10 student interpreters at the embassy to China, who shall be citizens of the United States and whose duty it shall be to study the Chinese language with a view to supplying interpreters to the embassy and consulates in China, at \$1,500 each, \$15,000: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan:



*And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter at the embassy or consulates in China so long as his services may be required within a period of five years.

Mr. LODGE. On page 4, in lines 14, 17, and 22, I move to amend the amendment by striking out the word "embassy" in each place and insert in lieu thereof the word "legation." It is a misprint.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters in China, at the rate of \$350 per annum each, \$3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 2, to insert:

For six student interpreters at the embassy to Japan, who shall be citizens of the United States and whose duty it shall be to study the Japanese language with a view to supplying interpreters to the embassy and consulates in Japan, at \$1,500 each, \$9,000: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter at the embassy or consulates in Japan so long as his services may be required within a period of five years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 13, to insert:

For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters at the embassy to Japan, at the rate of \$200 per annum each, \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 16, to insert:

For four student interpreters at the legation to Turkey, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the language of Turkey and any other language that may be necessary to qualify them for service as interpreters to the legation and consulates in Turkey, at \$1,500 each, \$6,000: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter to the legation and consulates in Turkey so long as his services may be required within a period of five years.

Mr. LODGE. There are two or three typographical errors which I desire to correct by amendment. On page 5, in line 17, I move to amend the amendment by striking out the word "legation" and inserting the word "embassy," and I move the same amendment to the amendment in line 21, and on line 1, page 6.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendments were, on page 6, after line 3, to insert:

For the payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters at the legation to Turkey, at the rate of \$200 per annum each, \$800.

And on page 6, after line 6, to insert:

No person drawing the salary of interpreter or student interpreter as above provided shall be allowed any part of the salary appropriated for any secretary of legation or other officer.

Mr. LODGE. On page 6, in line 5, where the word "legation" occurs, I move to strike it out and insert in lieu thereof the word "embassy."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 10, to insert, at the end of the items for interpreters to embassies and legations:

Total, \$39,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 11, to insert:

#### QUARTERS FOR STUDENT INTERPRETERS AT EMBASSIES.

For rent of quarters for the student interpreters attached to the embassy to Japan, \$1,200;

For rent of quarters for the student interpreters attached to the legation to Turkey, \$600;

Total, \$1,800.

Mr. LODGE. In line 16, I move to amend the amendment by striking out the word "legation" and inserting the word "embassy."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 18, to insert:

#### PAYMENT TO MRS. ANNA GALE WHITE.

To Mrs. Anna Gale White, widow of Jay White, late consul to Naples, Italy, \$4,500, one year's salary of her deceased husband, who died while at his post of duty from illness incurred in the Consular Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 10, to insert:

#### PAYMENT TO MRS. MARY A. HIGGINS.

To Mrs. Mary A. Higgins, widow of Edward Higgins, late consul to Bahia, Brazil, \$4,000, one year's salary of her deceased husband, who died while at his post of duty from illness incurred in the Consular Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 9, after the word "rent," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000," so as to read:

#### INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.

To enable the President to perform the obligations of the United States under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905, and 1906, between the United States and Mexico, including not to exceed \$600 for rent, \$5,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the chairman of the committee a question in reference to that item? I have no interest in it such as I had last year when a gentleman from my State occupied the office, but it seems to me as long as the law is in force we ought to appropriate enough to enable them to do some work.

Mr. LODGE. As long as the treaty is in force we have to make an appropriation sufficient to keep the commission alive. Last year we agreed to \$5,000 as a sufficient amount. The House, which is the economical body in our system of Government, at the present time raised it to \$10,000, and I thought I would bring it back to the amount of the appropriation of last year and find out in conference what is the necessity for the increased amount. I know of no reason why the sum given last year should be raised.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I said to the Senator, I think as long as we have the commission and as long as we have the law creating the commission we should appropriate enough to enable them to do some work.

Mr. LODGE. I agree; but the trouble is there have been no Mexican representatives, and nothing has been done as a matter of fact. The only way to deal with the Mexican boundary is to draw an arbitrary line.

Mr. McKELLAR. The chances are that we shall have Mexican representatives on the commission in the near future.

Mr. LODGE. As long as we undertake to use the river as a boundary it is very uncertain. The river is continually shifting, and endless surveys are necessary, and there is nothing staid. They have to have new negotiations for an arbitrary line. For the work that is being done I do not think there is any need of any more money than was appropriated last year. All I have done is to bring it back to the amount which was appropriated last year, after some debate, with a view, at least, of taking it to conference and asking why it should be doubled this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 16, to insert:

#### BUREAU OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION FOR PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

For the contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of International Arbitration at Brussels, Belgium, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 18, to insert:

#### UNITED STATES SECTION OF THE INTER-AMERICAN HIGH COMMISSION.

To defray the actual and necessary expenses on the part of the United States section of the Inter-American High Commission, \$25,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee what that commission is?

Mr. LODGE. We passed a bill providing for it last year, which has made this appropriation necessary.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not know whether it is what we had been calling the Pan-American Commission heretofore or not.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no. We passed a bill, in which the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] was very much interested. The purpose of the commission is—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I merely wanted to know about the establishment of the commission. Is it a permanent affair?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes; it has been established by law. The law was passed, I think, last year. I think the bill was introduced by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if the Committee on Appropriations did not cut out this item?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know that formerly when they considered the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill they cut out a lot of items. I do not remember whether this was in the bill at that time or not. My impression is that it was not. I do not remember having seen before a commission with this name.

Mr. LODGE. It was appropriated for last year and was one of those things that went out in the House on a point of order, as they cut out the item for student interpreters.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Is there any authority of law for it?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes; we passed a law providing for it and creating the commission.

Mr. KENYON. Is this the commission that went to South America?

Mr. LODGE. I can tell the Senator in a moment what is the purpose of it.

Dr. Rowe makes the following statement about the work of the commission:

The most important work the commission is able to do—and because of its special organization is peculiarly adapted to do—is to remove some of the obstacles and further closer financial and other cooperation throughout the Latin American countries, partly through securing uniform legislation. One of the great difficulties which the United States has always confronted has been a lack of organization in each of the Latin American countries working on this question of uniformity of legislation. We have now an organization which is elastic in the sense that in each country is a group of nine men, presided over by the minister of finance, all of whom are working on the same program.

Now, take the question of uniformity of laws relating to bills of lading, warehouse receipts, bills of exchange, and checks, which is a very important matter for our inter-American commerce to secure. We have taken the uniform bill of lading law which was worked out in the United States and had it translated and submitted it to those national sections in order to get their views as to whether that law, or that law with some amendments, could be made effective in their countries. They are at work upon it now. We can thereby secure greater uniformity of legislation without the handicaps which come when the United States, through official channels, suggests changes in domestic legislation of other countries. The same is true in connection with uniformity of laws relating to conditional sales, uniformity of laws relating to organization of corporations, and especially the operation of foreign corporations in those countries.

One of the things Senators may remember that was brought about by the commission was the ratification of several treaties getting rid of special taxes imposed on commercial travelers.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not know we had gotten rid of any taxes lately.

Mr. LODGE. We got rid of taxes in some other countries.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Leaving this country for the last. Can the Senator tell me how many members there are of this commission from each of the countries?

Mr. LODGE. I will tell the Senator; I have it here. The present membership of the United States section of the commission is as follows:

Hon. David F. Houston, Secretary of the Treasury, chairman.  
Hon. John Bassett Moore, New York City, vice chairman.  
John H. Fahy, Esq., Boston, Mass.  
Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, Jacksonville, Fla.—

I am glad to see the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] in the Chamber at this moment—

Hon. Andrew J. Peters, Boston, Mass.—

He is the mayor of Boston—

Samuel Untermyer, Esq., New York City.

Hon. Paul M. Warburg, New York City.

John H. Wigmore, Esq., Chicago, Ill.

Herbert Fleishacker, Esq., San Francisco, Calif.

Hon. L. S. Rowe, secretary general.

C. E. McGuire, assistant secretary general.

Guillermo A. Sherwell, juristic expert.

Mr. JONES of Washington. All these people are members of the commission?

Mr. LODGE. They are members of the commission.

Mr. JONES of Washington. From this country?

Mr. LODGE. From this country.

Mr. JONES of Washington. For what is this \$25,000 to be expended—for salaries or for employees?

Mr. LODGE. In the House hearings there is a statement of—

Expenditures of United States section of the International High Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1920.

Appropriation: United States section, International High Commission.

Salaries, wages—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not refer to the International High Commission, but to the Inter-American High Commission.

Mr. LODGE. The name has been changed, but it is the same commission. I am reading from the report submitted by the commission. The name of the commission was changed by law.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was changed to what?

Mr. LODGE. To the Inter-American High Commission. I am reading from a tabulated statement of expenditures made by the United States section of the International High Commission, but the name has since been changed, as I have indicated.

If the Senator from Washington wants all the details, I will say that the original name of the commission was established by the act approved February 7, 1916, but it was changed by virtue of the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920 to the Inter-American High Commission. These are the expenses:

Salaries, wages, and other compensation for personal services currently rendered, \$22,207.61.

Services other than personal—

Mr. JONES of Washington. Are there any annual salaries paid to the members of the commission?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think there are any fixed salaries at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. There are no salaries whatever paid to members of the commission.

Mr. LODGE. I think that \$25,000 were appropriated last year. The appropriation for the commission began in 1916, and from February 15, 1916, to October, 1918, the expenditures were \$40,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Is there nothing to determine the apportionment of the \$25,000?

Mr. LODGE. An appropriation was made in public act 128 of the Sixty-fourth Congress, available October 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919, of \$25,000. The next year the appropriation was the same. It has been in this bill for three or four years.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator from Washington that since then similar appropriations have been made for the commission year after year. It was finally discontinued by the Committee on Appropriations; and legislation since has, perhaps, changed the name of the commission and perhaps changed some of its duties. I think that is perhaps what the Senator from Washington has in mind.

Mr. LODGE. The legislation has been in this appropriation bill for two or three years. I think the commission was created by law, for I reported the bill out of my committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am not familiar with the terms of the act. I am simply asking these questions for information.

Mr. LODGE. I can send for a copy of the act. The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], who is more familiar with it than I am, can explain the act, I have no doubt, as he is a member of the commission.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida who apportions this appropriation of \$25,000; who determines how it shall be paid; what salaries are to be paid, and to whom?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Secretary of the Treasury is ex officio chairman of the commission. This appropriation is intended simply to pay the clerical help in connection with the work of the American section of the commission.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Do the members of the commission who attend get any compensation for their services?

Mr. FLETCHER. The members of the commission receive no compensation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They get their traveling expenses, I suppose?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; they do not get those. I never have understood that they get anything at all.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What do they do?

Mr. FLETCHER. They meet here when they are called in session and the work of the International High Commission, which has now been changed to the Inter-American High Commission, is as set forth in Document No. 261 by Hon. John Bassett Moore. Their work is set forth in the document quite in detail.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does the commission maintain offices here in Washington?

Mr. FLETCHER. They have offices here in the Treasury Building, but they do not rent any offices.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator refers to the American section?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; to the American section.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does the Inter-American High Commission have annual meetings?

Mr. FLETCHER. They have annual conferences or meetings.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Where do they meet?

Mr. FLETCHER. They met the last time here in Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am referring now to the whole commission.

Mr. FLETCHER. I refer to the entire commission. I will say to the Senator from Washington that there are nine delegates from each of the 21 so-called Latin-American Republics. They met here last, but in 1916 they met in Buenos Aires.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Who paid the expenses of the American commissioners to Buenos Aires?

Mr. FLETCHER. I take it that on the occasion of such conventions the respective Governments pay the expenses of their delegates.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Could expenses of the commission of that kind be paid out of this \$25,000?

Mr. FLETCHER. Not at all.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What is there to prevent it?



Mr. LODGE. The law would prevent that, I think.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There is nothing in this appropriation to prevent it.

Mr. LODGE. That is provided for in the law creating the commission, which was reported from my committee. I will send for a copy of the law if the Senator wants it.

Mr. FLETCHER. An itemized statement is furnished of the expenditures under the appropriation; and there is no part of it that can be used for any expenses of the kind which the Senator from Washington suggests—for traveling or salaries or compensation of members of the commission or anything of that sort.

Mr. JONES of Washington. How often does the American section of the commission meet?

Mr. FLETCHER. They meet probably once a month and perhaps oftener. They are subject to call. Whenever any question comes up which needs to be considered a session is called and they act upon it. Then afterwards the action taken is transmitted to the various other sections representing the other Republics.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does the law creating the commission fix the number of members on the part of the United States?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it does; that is my recollection. There are nine from each of the Republics, as I have stated.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Who appoints the commission?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Secretary of the Treasury, as I have stated, is ex officio chairman of the American section, and the other members are appointed by the President. The work of the commission, I may say, is set out, and without going into detail—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not wish the Senator to go into that. There were merely certain questions which I had in mind about which I desired information.

Mr. FLETCHER. This commission is engaged in very important work, I will say to the Senator, and they have accomplished some good results. Among other things they have established a patent office bureau in Cuba, for instance, so that, through the work which has been done by the commission and the convention which has followed it, a patent or a trade-mark can be recorded in Cuba, and also recorded throughout all of these associated Republics.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I remember about the patent matter; but my recollection is that that was arranged several years ago before this commission was created. I understand that the commission has only been created during the last two or three years.

Mr. FLETCHER. No; the last convention created the patent bureau at Habana, Cuba, which was established very recently, last year, I think.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, the Senator is mistaken about that, because that matter came before the Commerce Committee either before the war or while the war was going on.

Mr. FLETCHER. I can not name the exact date, but I know it is a new undertaking, and grew out of the work of the commission. The commission was established in 1913, as I recall.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understood the Senator from Massachusetts to say that it was created in 1916.

Mr. FLETCHER. The year 1913 was the beginning of it, I think.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand there is one member on the commission from San Francisco. Does he visit here every month?

Mr. FLETCHER. He does not usually attend the sessions here.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Would he have his expenses paid if he should come here?

Mr. FLETCHER. No, he would not; there is no provision for that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. How can we expect to get any very good service from a commission of this kind with men scattered all over the United States if we can not get them here?

Mr. FLETCHER. The commission is composed of men many of whom can come to Washington to attend its sessions. For instance, there is Dr. Moore, of Columbia University; Mr. Peters, of Boston; and Mr. Untermyer, of New York, who are readily accessible to Washington. The Secretary of the Treasury, as I have said, is ex officio member, and then there is Dr. Rowe, who is now director of the Pan American Union, and who resides in Washington; in fact, nearly all of them are convenient to Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations was, on page 18, line 21, after the numerals "1909," to strike out "\$38,000" and insert "\$50,000," so as to read:

WATERWAYS TREATY, UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN: INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN.

For salaries and expenses, including salaries of commissioners and salaries of clerks and other employees appointed by the commissioners on the part of the United States, with the approval solely of the Secretary of State, expense of printing, cost of law books, books of reference, and periodicals, and necessary traveling expenses, and for one-half of all reasonable and necessary joint expenses of the International Joint Commission incurred under the terms of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain concerning the use of boundary waters between the United States and Canada, and for other purposes, signed January 11, 1909, \$50,000, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I was not present at the meeting of the committee at which this amount was raised. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee why the appropriation has been increased?

Mr. LODGE. It was increased in order to preserve the present rate of salaries.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As I recall, last year we reduced the appropriation.

Mr. LODGE. We did not reduce the salaries.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Is this \$50,000 required to pay salaries?

Mr. LODGE. I think it is.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Was not the appropriation for last year \$38,000?

Mr. LODGE. The appropriation last year was \$46,000, and there are some additional expenses which it is necessary to incur which would not be sufficiently covered by the appropriation of last year, as we were informed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], who, as the Senator is aware, has been made a member of the commission.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I realize that; but my recollection is that last year we entered into a sort of an understanding that we would endeavor to reduce these unnecessary expenses, and we agreed in the committee at that time to a reduction in the appropriations rather than to an abolition of the commissions.

Mr. LODGE. We did; we reduced the appropriation in the case of the Mexican Boundary Commission to \$5,000, although this year the House has raised it to \$10,000.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The bill as reported by the Senate committee reduces that appropriation to \$5,000, but raises the appropriation for the International Joint Commission from \$38,000 to \$50,000.

Mr. LODGE. The Senate committee increased the amount as carried in the House bill, that is true, but the appropriation is only \$4,000 in excess of the appropriation of last year.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is an increase of \$12,000, though, over the House figures.

Mr. LODGE. The same question arose in the House last year in regard to increasing or decreasing the salaries of the commissioners.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I presume the Senator has looked into the matter.

Mr. LODGE. If the necessary expenses are to be paid and no increase is granted, there will be involved a decrease in the salaries paid.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I presume the Senator is more familiar with the activities of the commission than am I, but I am wondering whether they are such as to justify so large an expenditure.

Mr. LODGE. They have done some very important work although they have only occasional cases. They had some very important cases during the past year.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, the commissioners on the part of this country have to sit with those of Canada, so that there is involved not only the pay of the commissioners, but traveling expenses as well. The Canadian Government on its side pays its own expenses and the United States Government pays the expenses incurred by its commissioners.

Mr. LODGE. I can give the Senator some facts about it. According to the testimony before the House committee, there have been 17 cases referred to the commission by the joint action of the two Governments, of which three are still pending. There was a case involving the St. Mary and Milk Rivers and their tributaries in Montana, a case initiated by the commission under article 6 of the treaty. It was made the duty of the commission to measure and apportion those waters.

The case of the St. Lawrence Power Co. was referred to the commission by the two Governments, and also the case of the New York & Ontario Power Co. Furthermore, there was one decision, on which I can not now put my hand, but as the result of the settlement of that case by the commission there has been an annual payment of \$67,000 to the United States. I

have here a chronological abstract of the meetings during the calendar year 1920, if the Senator from Nebraska would care to hear them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I was more desirous of knowing whether the Senator had investigated so as to feel satisfied that the proposed increase in the appropriation was justified. I thought that what was sufficient for last year would probably be sufficient for the ensuing year.

Mr. LODGE. I thought it was proper that the present salaries should be maintained. If we reduce the appropriation to the House figure, it will be necessary to reduce the salaries of the commission.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I presume the members of the commission are not greatly overworked from what the Senator said, having, as I understand, about one case a year.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, that is all the Senator knows about it. I hardly expected that sort of criticism from such a source.

If there is no objection and if the Senate will bear with me, I desire to say a few words regarding this matter. I do not care to take the time of the Senate, but I have formulated a statement of the duties that will probably fall on the commission for the ensuing year, as well as a recital of the labors it has already performed in the years gone by, and the attitude held by both the Canadian Government and our own Government toward the commission.

Mr. LODGE. I think, if the Senator will allow me, that is all printed in the hearings of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. No; the hearings did not develop the points which I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Perhaps the House hearings did not cover all of them.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I deem it my duty to call attention of the Senate, and especially the attention of the conference committee on the diplomatic appropriation bill, to the House provision and the Senate amendment, as proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee, in the matter of the International Joint Commission. The House made an appropriation of only \$38,000 for the whole expenses of the commission for the year.

#### *Fiscal year 1922.*

Estimated for International Joint Commission.....	\$60,000
Amount carried in bill as passed by House.....	38,000
Estimated expenditures, July 1-June 30, 1921-22:	
1. Salaries:	
Three commissioners, at \$7,500.....	\$22,500
One secretary.....	4,000
One clerk.....	2,050
	28,550
2. Miscellaneous clerical help.....	1,250
	29,800
3. Printing report on St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation, \$10,000, of which the United States will pay one-half.....	5,000
Making a total of.....	34,800
4. Leaving a balance available for all other purposes, including transportation, subsistence, reporting hearings, stationery, miscellaneous printing, telegraph and telephone charges, office supplies and equipment, and other miscellaneous items, of.....	3,200
No provision is made for rent of office space in the District of Columbia.	
If rent at the present rate were allowed, at.....	3,000
The balance available for purposes itemized in paragraph 4 would amount to only.....	200

This in the light of the fact that by a decision of the commission several years ago in the Northern Power Co. case, at Sault Ste. Marie, the United States is getting \$66,000 annually and will continue to get it for 30 years to come and then own the property.

The Canadian Government deems the commission of such use and importance that it yearly appropriates \$75,000 and leaves such sum entirely in the hands of its members of the commission to be expended by them in their discretion. Ample room is provided at the headquarters of Canadian commission, while our commissioners have virtually no room at all either for the working use of any of the commissioners and no proper

place for the hearings which must be frequently had in this city. The commission will meet in this city in April next to transact business of importance. We have no place in any degree adequate for this meeting. Only three small rooms, and each filled with records, desks, boxes containing papers, books, memoranda, and the like, a table, chairs, and so forth. For such quarters we are paying the outrageous sum of \$3,000 a year, which is more than was charged for six rooms before the war. Hence the Senate committee has provided for rent of proper rooms in the District of Columbia, in case adequate quarters can not be secured in a Government-owned building.

The important duties of the commission are not fully appreciated by Congress, but fully known to the Canadian Government. A vacancy occurred in the commission by the death of Gov. Glenn in May last, since which time no action by the commission has been taken as a full membership must be present at the time of any decision by it.

There are very important international questions before the commission for decision, and others will soon be presented as now seems certain. For instance, the Red River of the North has its source at Breckenridge, Minn., and is the boundary between that State and North Dakota, and empties into Lake Winnipeg, Canada. From source to boundary line it is 400 miles.

"An act (Public, No. 277, 66th Cong.) approved June 5, 1920, authorizes the construction of flood-control and improvement works in Boise de Sioux River, the Red River of the North, and Lake Traverse, between the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

"This construction is contemplated to be done by the Tri-State Flood Control Association.

"This association, by resolution of December 16, 1920, requested the Department of State to submit the question of flood control to the International Joint Commission. Gov. Lynn Frazier, of North Dakota, in transmitting the resolution to the Secretary of State, states that he is convinced that the matter is of great enough importance to be considered by the International Joint Commission.

"The United States section of the commission has been requested to advise the Secretary of State with reference to the character and importance of this contemplated improvement, with a view to its reference to the commission."

The St. Mary and Milk River controversies are still pending, as is also the New York & Ontario Power Co. case. The St. Lawrence River Power Co. application has had only an interim approval. The St. Lawrence River case has the following history and is still pending:

"17. St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation.

"Section 9 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1919, entitled 'An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes' (Public, No. 323, 65th Cong., 2d sess.), reads as follows:

"Sec. 9. That the International Joint Commission created by the treaty between the United States and Great Britain relating to boundary waters between the United States and Canada, signed at Washington January 11, 1909, under the provisions of article 9 of said treaty, is requested to investigate what further improvement of the St. Lawrence River between Montreal and Lake Ontario is necessary to make the same navigable for ocean-going vessels, together with the estimated cost thereof, and report to the Government of the Dominion of Canada and to the Congress of the United States, with its recommendations for cooperation by the United States with the Dominion of Canada in the improvement of said river."

"The Governments of the United States and the Dominion of Canada each appointed a representative to confer and prepare the questions involved in the form of a reference by the two Governments to the International Joint Commission. The reference was received by the commission on January 22, 1920. The questions referred for investigation are as follows:

"1. What further improvement in the St. Lawrence River, between Montreal and Lake Ontario, is necessary to make the same navigable for deep-draught vessels of either the lake or ocean going type; what draught of water is recommended; and what is the estimated cost?

"In answering this question, the commission is requested to consider—

"(a) Navigation interests alone, whether by the construction of locks and dams in the river, by side canals with the necessary locks, or by a combination of the two.

"(b) The combination of navigation and power interests to obtain the greatest beneficial use of the waters of the river.

"2. Which of the schemes submitted by the Government or other engineers is preferable, and why?



"3. Under what general method of procedure and in what general order shall the various physical and administrative features of the improvement be carried out?"

"4. Upon what basis shall the capital cost of the completed improvement be apportioned to each country?"

"5. Upon what basis shall the costs of operation and maintenance be apportioned to each country?"

"6. What method of control is recommended for the operation of the improved waterway to secure its most beneficial use?"

"7. Will regulating Lake Ontario increase the low-water flow in the St. Lawrence ship channel below Montreal? And if so, to what extent and at what additional cost?"

"8. To what extent will the improvement develop the resources, commerce, and industry of each country?"

"9. What traffic, both incoming and outgoing, in kind and quantity, is likely to be carried upon the proposed route, both at its inception and in the future? Consideration to be given not only to present conditions but to probable changes therein resulting from the development of industrial activities, due to availability of large quantities of hydraulic power.

"The reference requires that one engineer be appointed by each Government, from its engineering personnel, to prepare outline plans, with estimates of cost of the proposed work, and report to the commission within one year from the date of their appointment. The United States engineer was appointed on January 30, 1920, and the Canadian engineer on April 14, 1920.

"The commission is requested in the reference to submit its report to the two Governments within three months after the receipt of the engineers' report.

"The reference also requests the commission to hold such public hearings as may be considered necessary or advisable in order to obtain all information bearing directly or indirectly on the physical, commercial, and economic feasibility of the project as a whole.

"The commission began its investigation of questions 8 and 9 in March, holding public hearings in the following cities on the dates indicated:

	1920.
Buffalo, N. Y.	Mar. 1, 2
North Bay, Ontario	May 7
Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.	May 10
Marquette, Mich.	May 10
Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario	May 11
Fort William, Ontario	May 13
Winnipeg, Manitoba	May 15
Grand Forks, N. Dak.	May 18
Regina, Saskatchewan	May 20
Calgary, Alberta	May 21
Great Falls, Mont.	May 24
Helena, Mont.	May 26
Boise, Idaho	May 28
Cheyenne, Wyo.	May 29
Omaha, Nebr.	June 1
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	June 2
Des Moines, Iowa	June 3, 4, 5
Duluth, Minn.	June 3, 4, 5
Superior, Wis.	June 7
Ashland, Wis.	June 8
Milwaukee, Wis.	June 9
Toledo, Ohio	June 10
London, Ontario	June 11
Hamilton, Ontario	June 12
Buffalo, N. Y.	June 14, 15
Montreal, Quebec	Oct. 8, 9
Kingston, Ontario	Oct. 11
Toronto, Ontario	Oct. 13, 14
Albany, N. Y.	Oct. 15
Boston, Mass.	Oct. 18
New York, N. Y.	Oct. 19, 20, 21
Detroit, Mich.	Oct. 22, 23, 25
Grand Rapids, Mich.	Oct. 25
Minneapolis, Minn.	Oct. 27, 28
Chicago, Ill.	Oct. 29, 30
Indianapolis, Ind.	Nov. 1
Cleveland, Ohio	Nov. 2, 3
New York, N. Y.	Dec. 6

"Some 8,000 typewritten pages of testimony have thus far been taken on these questions, together with a large volume of statistical matter, which is being considered by the commission. Further hearings on these two questions, as well as on the other questions referred, will be held in order to develop the requisite information upon which to base the report of the commission."

The foregoing is given as an example of the necessary labor involved in ascertaining the essential facts in cases submitted

and the time and labor consumed in proper consideration of them.

Summarizing what has been done by the commission we find cases reported to the respective Governments, 3; cases approved by commission, 9; cases dismissed, 1; cases withdrawn after hearing, 1; cases now pending, 3.

It is enough to say, in justification of the commission, that during the few years of its existence it has, without leaving any resentment behind, settled and finally disposed of more controverted questions between the two Governments and the citizens thereof than has otherwise been settled since the formation of our Government, and all that without costing the Treasury one dollar.

In an address delivered in Boston before the Victorian Club about one year ago, Mr. Burpee, a distinguished Canadian citizen, taking as the subject of his address "A successful experiment in international relations," took occasion to go fully into the value of the labor performed and the good results to both nations flowing from the International Joint Commission, and in closing his address, after giving a history of the delays of the old diplomacy and the bitterness engendered by these delays, said:

"Meanwhile, bitterness of feeling has been allowed to grow between two groups of people, separated only by an invisible boundary, and with every reason in the world for a neighborly attitude toward one another.

"One need not labor the point that this tribunal, open as freely to the humblest citizen of either country as to the representatives of the Federal Governments, marks a big step forward in the relations of these two neighboring Commonwealths; and it does seem to me that the true measure of the commission's usefulness to the people of the United States and Canada lies not even so much in its positive as in its negative qualities, not so much in the cases it has actually settled as in the infinitely larger number of cases that never come before it for consideration, simply because the commission is there, as a sort of international safety valve, and therefore the sting is taken out of the situation."

Mr. President, I am soon to become a member of the International Joint Commission. I have no desire to draw, for my own use, money from the Treasury without a feeling that I had justly earned it by faithful, efficient service. I have looked into the duties and responsibilities of the commission deep enough to know that any member of it who performs those duties well will not only earn his pay but also the gratitude of the two nations concerned.

"One may not perhaps realize at first the very unusual character of this tribunal. There is nothing else quite like it, nor has there been in the past. We have here three Americans and three Canadians, sitting not as national sections, more or less antagonistic, but as one judicial body, and pledged to give their best possible judgment, with the utmost impartiality, to the settlement of questions that arise sometimes on one side of the boundary and sometimes on the other. It is significant of the sympathetic attitude of Canadians and Americans toward each other and toward their common problems, that in every case dealt with by the commission since its organization the decision has been unanimous.

"The work of promoting closer and more direct relations between the two great peoples on this continent who have the same language, come from the same race, have the same common fountain of law, the same traditions, and similar institutions of government, as well as the same ambitions for the continued success of their respective Governments, is in fact the work of blazing the trail for the judicial settlement of all disputes where they occur between any two great nations.

"The chief cause for congratulation, however, is that this treaty has provided a means for frank, direct, and constant relations between the two neighboring peoples who inhabit the greater part of the North American Continent, and who must live in amicable relations to realize the ultimate ideal of our Anglo-Saxon civilization. This commission constitutes the medium for this direct communication, and to it, by the express terms of the treaty, may be referred for consideration and settlement all questions of difference that may arise between the peoples living along our common frontier, without reservations or qualifications of any kind.

"Mr. Taft and the late Col. Roosevelt, among others on the United States side of the line, the Duke of Connaught, the Duke of Devonshire, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and Sir Robert Borden on the Canadian side, have on various occasions drawn the attention of the public to the importance and significance of the treaty of 1909 and of the work intrusted to the International Joint Commission. During one of the recent discussions

at the peace congress in connection with the organization of the International Waterways Commission, it is understood that Sir Robert Borden made particular reference to the jurisdiction of this commission as an illustration of what might be accomplished in connection with such European rivers of an international character as the Rhine and the Danube."

The American Journal of International Law has time and again referred in highest praise of the treaty of 1909, negotiated in Washington between Mr. Bryce, representing England, and Mr. Root, Secretary of State, and has often congratulated both nations on the creation of the International Joint Commission and the successful results of its labor. The existence of the commission with power to act is worth far more than it costs if only one case a year came before it. Everybody seems satisfied except our Congress, where it has been proposed to cut off the appropriation to the point of preventing any investigation by the commission.

This is very humiliating to the United States members of the commission, who would be unable to bear their part of any joint expense, and discourteous to Canada.

The Canadian commission receives \$75,000 a year to be expended in its discretion. The House has voted the sum of \$38,000 a year for expenses of our commission.

As I have shown at the beginning of these remarks, that sum, after paying salaries and clerk hire and our part of printing evidence already taken, and the rent, now of necessity being paid, leaves the commission the whole full sum of \$200 to pay for transportation and subsistence when absent on official business, reporting hearings, stationery, miscellaneous printing, telegraph and telephone charges, office supplies and equipment, and the dozens of other small miscellaneous expenses incident to any business.

The commission should have \$60,000. It can not function on less than \$50,000, which is \$25,000 less than Canada, less able than we, willingly pays to her members.

Let us at least respect our treaty obligations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, can the Senator put in the RECORD a statement of what the commission actually did during the current year?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes, sir; I will submit the whole list.

Mr. LODGE. That is all printed in the House hearings.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes; I think it is.

Mr. LODGE. Every meeting of the commission is set out there.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to have it put in the RECORD, if possible, because this question has come up every year, and the impression has been current that the commission was not doing anything, and that these offices were mere sinecures, and that the expense was largely an unnecessary one. If the commission is rendering valuable service, it ought to be shown, and the RECORD ought to show it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I should think the mere statement of fact that we have made a treaty and it has gone on this long to the infinite satisfaction of both Governments and has resulted in the settlement of many of these cases to which reference is made in the hearings would be sufficient. I ask that that list be printed in the RECORD in connection with what I have said.

Mr. LODGE. There is a complete list of all the meetings of the commission on page 39 of the House hearings, showing exactly what the commission did.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask to have that printed.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator asks to have it printed with his remarks?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask that it be printed in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CHRONOLOGICAL ABSTRACT OF MEETINGS DURING THE CALENDAR YEAR 1920.

Boston, Mass., January 13, 1920: At request of interested parties, conference was held at Boston with Chairman Gardner regarding procedure in the matter of the remonstrance by residents of the city of Newport, Vt., and of other localities in the vicinity of Lake Memphremagog with respect to flowage damage caused by raising the crest of a dam at the outlet of the said lake.

New York, N. Y., February 11, 1920: Commission met at New York, all members being present except Mr. Clark, who was delayed by impaired train service.

Matters considered: Draft treaty regarding pollution of boundary waters.

New York, N. Y., February 12, 1920: Commission met at New York; all members present.

Matters considered: Draft treaty regarding pollution of boundary waters; St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation.

New York, N. Y., February 13, 1920: Commission met at New York; all members present.

Matters considered: Draft treaty, pollution of boundary waters; measurement and apportionment of the waters of St. Mary and Milk Rivers in the State of Montana and Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan; St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation.

New York, N. Y., February 14, 1920: Commission met at New York; all members present.

Matters considered: Draft treaty, pollution of boundary waters. Buffalo, N. Y., March 1, 1920: Commission met at Buffalo; all members present.

Matters considered: St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation.

Buffalo, N. Y., March 2, 1920: Commission met at Buffalo; all members present.

Matters considered: St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation.

Washington, D. C., April 6, 1920: Commission met at Washington, D. C.; all members present.

Matters considered: St. Mary and Milk Rivers case; St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation; draft treaty, pollution of boundary waters.

Washington, D. C., April 7, 1920: Commission met at Washington; all members present.

Matters considered: Draft treaty, pollution of boundary waters; St. Mary and Milk Rivers case; St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation.

Ottawa, Ontario, May 3, 1920: Commission met at Ottawa; all members present except Mr. Glenn.

Matters considered: Draft treaty, pollution of boundary waters; St. Mary and Milk Rivers case. Reargument began in St. Mary and Milk Rivers case.

Ottawa, Ontario, May 4, 1920: Commission met at Ottawa; all members present except Mr. Glenn.

Matters considered: Resignation of secretary of United States section; continuation of reargument in St. Mary and Milk Rivers case.

Ottawa, Ontario, May 5, 1920: Commission met at Ottawa; all members present except Mr. Glenn.

Matters considered: St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation. Conclusion in reargument in St. Mary and Milk Rivers case.

Ottawa, Ontario, May 6, 1920: Commission met at Ottawa; all members present except Mr. Glenn.

Matters considered: St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation.

North Bay, Ontario, May 7, 1920: Commission met at North Bay to begin hearings in St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation; all members present.

Beginning on this date and continuing for 41 days without adjournment, the commission conducted hearings in the St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation, covering territory westward from North Bay, Ontario, to Calgary and eastward from Boise and Cheyenne, closing the series of hearings at Buffalo June 15.

The death of Mr. Glenn at Wianipeg, Manitoba, on May 16, created a vacancy in the United States section.

Portland, Me., September 10, 1920: At the request of interested parties Chairman Gardner held conferences at Portland regarding hearings in St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation.

Ottawa, Ontario, October 5, 1920: Commission met at Ottawa; present, Messrs. Powell, Clark, Gardner, and Sir William Hearst.

Matters considered: St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation; St. Mary and Milk Rivers case.

Ottawa, Ontario, October 6, 1920: Commission met at Ottawa; members present as on October 5.

Matters considered: St. Mary and Milk Rivers case; draft treaty in pollution of boundary waters matter, transmitted to the two Governments; St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation.

Montreal, Quebec, October 8, 1920: Commission met at Montreal; present, Messrs. Gardner, Clark, Powell, and Sir William Hearst.

Chairman Magrath, of the Canadian section, joined the commission at Kingston, Ontario.

Beginning at Montreal, October 8, and continuing for 27 days without adjournment, the commission conducted hearings in the St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation, covering territory from Montreal and New York on the east to Minneapolis, Minn., on the west, thence eastward, including Chicago and Indianapolis, closing the series at Cleveland on November 3.

New York, N. Y., December 6, 1920: Commissioners Clark and Sir William Hearst met at New York to hear certain witnesses in the St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation.

Portland, Me., December 15, 1920: At request of interested parties Chairman Gardner held conferences at Portland regarding hearings on St. Lawrence River navigation and power investigation.

Washington, D. C., December 28, 1920: Conference between Chairman Gardner, Commissioner Clark, and representative of United States Reclamation Service regarding St. Mary and Milk Rivers case.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I formerly entertained the same idea of this commission that many of the Senators do, because I had never had any occasion to inquire into it. If I shall take a position on that body, there are 8,000 pages of testimony in a pending case that I shall have to read and digest as far as I am able to do so. In addition to that, the intricate cases of the St. Marys River and the Milk River are still pending. They are of great importance to both countries and their settlement is extremely essential to good feeling between the two peoples.

As I said, at one time I entertained the same view that the Senator has referred to; but since I have come to look into it and have taken occasion to inquire into it, I find not only that the commission is a very important one but that there is a great deal of work connected with it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations was, on page 19, line 2, after the words "official business," to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That a part of this appropriation may be expended for rent of offices for the commission in the District of Columbia, in the event that the Public Buildings Commission is unable to supply suitable office space.

The amendment was agreed to.



The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 21, to insert:  
INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL.

To pay the annual share of the United States, as an adhering member of the International Research Council and of the Associated Unions, organized at Brussels, July 18-28, 1919, as follows: International Research Council, \$129; International Astronomical Union, \$772; International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry, \$290; International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, \$1,338; International Union of Mathematics, \$129; in all, \$2,658, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not the International Research Council is organized under any treaty?

Mr. LODGE. All these associated unions were organized at Brussels. They are all scientific bodies. We have been a member of all of them. During the war there was an interference with the meetings of these different associations. This is a mere consolidation of the small contributions which we are bound by treaty agreement to make. We have consolidated them under this one head.

Mr. JONES of Washington. This council seems to have been organized in July, 1919.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; since the war they were brought together under this one head.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I take it, however, that we are not bound by a treaty agreement. Under what authority of law are any agreements of this kind made when they are not pursuant to a treaty?

Mr. LODGE. I understood that these were all treaty obligations. We have been carrying many of them, I know, as separate things. I will read the testimony. Dr. Kellogg was asked:

I wish, Dr. Kellogg, that for the sake of the completeness of the record, you would indicate in a general way the status of the National Research Council and of these national unions, which I understand are organizations of the United States.

Mr. KELLOGG. National sections?

Mr. ROGERS. National sections; yes.

Mr. KELLOGG. Well, the National Research Council itself was established during the war. It was established for the purpose of mobilizing the scientific resources in laboratories for the aid of the Government in connection with war-time problems which were based, really, on science and scientific investigations. So, as an offshoot of the National Academy of Sciences, which has a congressional charter, this body called the "National Research Council" was instituted. And it was very active in getting the cooperation of scientific men and university laboratories all over the country for the purposes of applying all the resources of American science to the solution of these special war-time problems that involved science.

At the conclusion of the war the council had been so successful in its work that the President issued an Executive order in May, 1918, asking the council to perpetuate itself as a peace-time organization, to be in a position to give the Government advice and assistance whenever called on by the Government in connection with any of the problems that might come up that involved scientific investigations.

And so, pursuant to this Executive order, the council was reorganized on a peace-time basis, but is no longer supported by the Government. Its support comes from private sources; it receives gifts for its administrative expenses. It has received a gift, or has been promised a gift, for the erection of a building as headquarters of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council, and gifts for the development of specific scientific projects, and especially those of national importance, whose solution would help the national welfare.

Then he goes on to explain the gifts which have been made, and he says:

Our yearly budget is about \$200,000 plus \$100,000 a year for five years for national fellowships.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That gives the information that I desired.

Mr. LODGE. These are the contributions made by the United States or agreed to by the United States under the order of the President, as I understand.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; that is the way I understand it. I do not think, however, that the President can bind us indefinitely to membership in any organization.

Mr. LODGE. Some of them are different, as I remember. I was speaking from memory. Mr. Rogers says:

We have here and there associations of one kind or another for which we have been appropriating for years and are still asked to appropriate, such as the International Bureau of Weights and Measures.

That is a treaty agreement, I know.

The International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs.

That is another.

The International Bureau at Brussels for the Suppression of the African Slave Trade.

That is another.

The International Prison Commission—

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; but those are not included in this item at all.

Mr. LODGE. No; they are not.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They are separate items.

Mr. LODGE. He says the Bureau of Weights and Measures is very much alive. Of course we have a separate appropriation for that in this bill.

Mr. WARREN. You get the estimates for it from the State Department?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; they are State Department estimates. They are all estimated for. We pay these sums as a member of these different scientific organizations, and Dr. Walcott, the secretary of the Smithsonian, appeared before the committee in behalf of it, as did also the president of the Carnegie Institute. It is simply our adhering membership; that is all.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I take it this is not pursuant to any treaty at all?

Mr. LODGE. I do not see that it is.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know it was the policy of the Senate two or three years ago to strike out items which were not required by reason of treaty conventions. I am not going to ask to strike this out. I really do not like to see the Senate putting such items into the bill unless there is some treaty obligation to do so. Whenever the Executive or the Secretary of State or the diplomatic organization of the Government thinks some organization ought to be formed and they go ahead and form it, then they send an estimate for an appropriation to Congress. I do not think that ought to be encouraged.

Mr. LODGE. We pay for the publication, as I understand it. It is thought to be very valuable, and that we should be a member. Of course the cost of it is a hundred thousand dollars a year, which is paid for by private subscription. But it is thought desirable that we should have our share in all these scientific councils. It was reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and was in the bill as reported to the Committee of the Whole House, but went out on a point of order, as so many other items did, some of them items similar to those which have been in this bill for 40 years.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish we had a rule by which it could go out of here on a point of order, but we have no rule under which, if a matter is reported by a standing committee or has been estimated for, a point of order will lie. So a point of order can not be made against this item. I do not think we ought to permit these things until Congress authorizes them. Whenever a department of the Government thinks an agreement of any kind ought to be entered into, it seems to me it ought to be submitted to Congress and ratified before we go into it. But that does not seem to be the policy of the Government.

Mr. LODGE. I agree with the Senator that it is a bad method of doing business; but this agreement has been made. I should like to take it into conference and see what the House has to say about it, as it originated there.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 9, after the word "legation" to strike out "building" and insert "buildings," and in line 10, after the word "grounds" to strike out "At San Salvador," so as to make the heading read:

Embassy and legation buildings and grounds.

Mr. LODGE. I have an amendment to offer to the amendment, which is a mere change of language. On lines 9 and 10, page 21, I move to amend the title so as to read:

Embassy, legation and consular buildings and grounds.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 20, to strike out:

The Secretary of State is hereby authorized to accept the gift of the residence of J. P. Morgan in London, England, which has been offered to the Government of the United States as a residence for the American ambassador.

And in lieu to insert:

The President is hereby authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, for use as a residence by the diplomatic representatives of the United States, the land and buildings thereon known as Nos. 13-14 Prince's Gate in the city of London, England, and such other lands and buildings as form a part of said property, presented by J. Pierpont Morgan: *Provided*, That the transfer of said property to the United States shall be unconditional and shall not impose restrictions upon subsequent sale, transfer, or use: *And provided further*, That the property is held on freehold tenure and not on customary London ground lease and that said property has no mortgage or other encumbrance or liability upon it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to ask a question about that amendment. Of course, my first impression with reference to a matter of that kind was against the Government accepting a gift of this sort. I have long been in favor of the Government acquiring proper and adequate embassy buildings; in the different important cities of the world, at any rate. But we have not done so. It does not look just right that we should be put in the position of apparently having to depend upon private donations for Government embassy buildings in those countries. Probably that is not the right position to take. But

what I wanted to ask the Senator was as to the value of this property.

Mr. LODGE. These houses were the property of Mr. Junius Morgan, the grandfather of the present Mr. Morgan, and were afterwards occupied, and I think one of them added, by the late John Pierpont Morgan. He kept his collections there in London and lived there himself. The price he paid for the houses was something over £30,000, \$150,000, as the exchange was then.

Mr. JONES of Washington. So that from the information the Senator has the value of this property is not very much, if any, in excess of what may be paid at other capitals for embassy buildings.

Mr. LODGE. No; that is the allowance made.

Mr. JONES of Washington. So that the cost of maintaining and running these buildings, after we do accept them, will probably not be more than in the other cities?

Mr. LODGE. I would like to state to the Senator on that point that I am familiar with these two houses. I have not seen them for a long time, but I do know where they are. They are very well situated, and they are suitable houses. They will have to be thrown together—that is, opened up one into the other; but the two together would make a very suitable and proper embassy, amply large enough, but not ostentatious or extravagant. They correspond very well to such a house as Mr. Choate had on Carlton House Terrace, a house any of us would think appropriate for an American embassy, but it did not have the splendor which characterized some other houses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 13, to insert:

For the acquisition of embassy, legation, or consular buildings and grounds at any or all of the following places: Paris, Rome, Brussels, Berlin, Athens, Belgrade, Bucharest, Prague, Monrovia, Vienna, Budapest, Canton, Hankow, and Amoy, \$300,000: *Provided*, That the limit of cost shall not exceed the sum of \$150,000 at any one place: *And provided further*, That such acquisition shall be subject to the approval of the commission hereinafter constituted.

Mr. LODGE. I move to amend that by inserting, after the word "Berlin," the word "Christiania."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 22, line 16, after the word "Berlin" and the comma, insert the word "Christiania" and a comma.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I would like to ask the Senator with reference to this paragraph. I know in the House text they provide for land and buildings in Paris, \$150,000. So, why should that be included in this paragraph?

Mr. LODGE. It is unnecessary to include Paris here.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Would it not be wise to leave it out?

Mr. LODGE. I think so, because the other has been agreed to. I ask that Paris be left out, because that is provided for. I had not thought of that. It obviously ought to come out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment to the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 22, line 16, in the committee amendment, strike out the word "Paris" and the comma.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the bill about the amendment we have just agreed to. I see that \$300,000 is to be appropriated for the building or purchasing of embassies and legations and other consular buildings at 14 different places, with a minimum cost of \$150,000. I suppose there is some plan in reference to the matter, but surely we could not get—

Mr. LODGE. This is based on the general law which was passed some years ago—I will have the date of it in a moment—providing for the expenditure of \$500,000 annually for the acquisition of buildings, with a limitation of \$150,000. This was suggested by the House to the committee, with a limitation of \$300,000, \$200,000 less than the general law limit, in the hope that under present conditions we could get some very desirable embassy and legation buildings. There are a good many for sale just at the present time at very moderate prices.

Mr. McKELLAR. In some of the European capitals this would be an appropriate time to buy.

Mr. LODGE. It is an appropriate time to buy. The rest of the amendment, the Senator will see, is designed to enable us to provide ourselves with some embassy and legation buildings and have the cost charged up to debts that are due to us, which we might not recover in any other way.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator if it is thought that it is possible to purchase embassies and legations or consular buildings in all these places for \$300,000?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no.

Mr. HARRISON. I was thinking that if we could do that they would be great bargains.

Mr. LODGE. This was only to give them a chance to buy where they found a good opportunity to buy.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand the plan is to enable us to credit them with what they owe us, in purchasing embassy and legation buildings in a country that owes us.

Mr. LODGE. That is covered by the rest of it.

Mr. HARRISON. But if the whole paragraph should be written into the law, you have a limit that in no event shall the buildings cost over \$300,000?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; they can not go over that amount in any one case.

Mr. HARRISON. It might be possible for the commission that is designated here to purchase consular buildings or embassies at all these places, but it would cost a great deal more than \$300,000.

Mr. LODGE. It is limited to the coming fiscal year, absolutely.

Mr. HARRISON. There is no limit of cost except \$150,000 to each one?

Mr. LODGE. That is all.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts stated a moment ago that we might by this plan get a portion of the foreign debts paid to us that we could not get in any other way. I hope the Senator does not mean to say any of those debts ought to be remitted?

Mr. LODGE. I did not mean to impugn the credit of any country at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not impugn the credit, but I hope the Senator does not think that any of those debts ought to be relinquished.

Mr. LODGE. How does the Senator mean?

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope, in making the statement that perhaps we might not be able to get some of our foreign debts paid in any other way, the Senator did not mean to express the view that those debts ought to be remitted.

Mr. LODGE. I only said that in a humorous way when I spoke about getting it in no other way. I think it is pretty generally known that I am not in favor of canceling debts.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to hear the Senator express himself in that way.

The next amendment was on page 22, after line 21, to insert:

There is hereby constituted a commission composed of the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Treasury, of which the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate shall be the chairman, whose duty it shall be to consider and formulate plans or proposals for the purchase of embassy, legation, and consular buildings and grounds under the authority contained in this act.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask one question as to the provision that has just been read? I notice in forming the commission that the chairman is to be the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is also provided that the Secretary of State shall be a member of the commission. Why is it that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is placed over the Secretary of State as chairman of this particular commission?

Mr. LODGE. In reply to the Senator, I have to say that this particular amendment was prepared by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for submission to the House. It is not the work of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask, if it had been the work of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, would they have placed the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations over the Secretary of State as chairman of the commission?

Mr. LODGE. I rather think the reason for the position being given to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House is because those committees make the appropriations.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to suggest that this is an amendment presented by the Foreign Relations Committee, and it evidently has indorsed the arrangement.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes; we do not object to the House draft.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi that I think this is perfectly correct. If I had drafted the provision myself, I would have put it just the way it is now.

Mr. HARRISON. I am not finding fault with it.



Mr. SMOOT. The Senate of the United States makes Secretaries of State, but Secretaries of State do not make the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. I merely think it places the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations higher, almost, than the Secretary of State.

Mr. SMOOT. It is a higher position.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 7, to insert:

With the approval of said commission and within a limit of cost at any one place of \$150,000, the Secretary of State shall have power to purchase from any foreign Government suitable embassy, legation, and consular buildings and grounds in any city specified in the foregoing paragraph and to effect payment therefor by causing the purchase price thereof to be credited upon the obligations or debts of such Government then held by or owing to the United States, or by causing a part of such purchase price so to be credited, paying the remainder in money from applicable sums hereinbefore appropriated for the acquisition of embassy, legation, and consular buildings and grounds; and when the Secretary of State shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury that a purchase has been made, the Government from which made, and that a part or all of the purchase price is to be paid by crediting the same upon obligations or debts of said Government then held by or owing to the United States, the date as of which said payment is to be made and the amount in United States dollars so to be credited, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to credit the amount so certified upon unpaid principal or interest of obligations or debts of said foreign Government held by the United States: And provided further, That the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to accept on behalf of the United States unconditional gifts of land, buildings, furniture, and furnishings, or any of them, for the use of diplomatic and consular offices and residences.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 20, to increase the appropriation for salaries of consuls general, consuls, and vice consuls from "\$1,774,500" to "\$1,974,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 25, to increase the total for salaries of the Consular Service from "\$1,809,500" to "\$2,009,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 9, to insert:

POST ALLOWANCES TO DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS.

To enable the President, in his discretion, and in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make special allowances by way of additional compensation to diplomatic and consular officers and consular assistants and officers of the United States Court for China in order to adjust their official income to the ascertained cost of living at the posts to which they may be assigned, \$500,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have always opposed this provision. I have not been in favor of giving the President the unlimited power that is given here, that can be exercised only through subordinates, in an attempt to adjust living costs by indiscriminate and promiscuous increase of salaries. I think that Congress ought to provide for whatever increase they think ought to be made. They ought to do it, of course, upon recommendations and data and information submitted to them by the State Department and by those who are thoroughly familiar with the situation.

There is no doubt that there are peculiar and exceptional circumstances at various posts. Probably it might be difficult to frame a general provision that would work absolute justice in all cases. We have attempted to adjust the salaries of Government employees in this country to meet the changed living conditions. We have made provision that may work well in one case, but it does not furnish ample consideration in other cases. We have not attempted in this country to give to the Secretary of the Interior, for instance, the unlimited power to adjust the compensation of his employees to meet differences in the cost of living. We have not placed in his hands a lump sum with which to do that. I think it is wrong in principle to do it in this case.

I simply wished to express my view with reference to this amendment. I am opposed to it just as much now, when a new administration is coming in, as I have been in the past. I hope that during the next year we may have a general reclassification of the salaries of the employees of the Government, including not only employees in this country in domestic affairs but including the Diplomatic and Consular Service and those who are in the employ of the Government in foreign countries, and that we will not in any other bill make an endeavor to carry a provision of this kind.

Mr. MOSES. I will say to the Senator that that happens to be exactly the question considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations in regard to that portion of the bill. We were much opposed to a lump-sum amendment in dealing with diplomatic and consular officers, but we had to consider the situation as it confronted us. We were confronted with the condition that exists in European capitals and throughout the Old World in general, where conditions of living which made this sort of appropriation necessary during the war still continue. We hope to

diminish the scale to such an extent that this sort of items can be absolutely dispensed with by the time the next appropriation bill comes before the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not desire to delay the passage of the bill, but the question which the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] brought up is one that I agree with fully. If there is one thing in the Government that is needed, it is a just and fair reclassification of the salaries of its employees and then a brake put on the question of the Congress at every session attempting to readjust salaried positions. At the same time it would avoid the question of trying to deal with these propositions in wholesale at either end of the line. I do not think the Government can come to an economical administration of its affairs or a just treatment of its employees unless an effort is really made by the Congress to fairly adjust salaries in accordance with the work performed and the necessities of the employees.

I have no criticism of the committee. I know all the grave responsibilities that rest on the Committee on Appropriations and the difficulties of the past, but I do hope that next summer, when other committees will probably be engaged in work that will be keeping the Congress here and the time of the Appropriations Committee will not be occupied with appropriation bills, that the Senator, a member of that committee, will appoint himself a committee of one, as he has expressed himself so heartily in favor of the proposition, and work out the problem and bring it to the Congress in concrete form, so that we can fairly and intelligently pass on it, settle it, and get it out of the way for the future.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think I can say to the Senator from Alabama that it is the disposition and, I might say, the determination of the different members of the Committee on Appropriations to take action of some kind very early in the next Congress to meet the situation. If it is found that we can not get the cooperation of the Appropriations Committee in the other branch of Congress to deal with the matter in its entirety, I hope that the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate will take up bills that come within its jurisdiction covering the matter and try to meet the situation.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], who addressed himself a moment ago to the Senator from Washington, whether the amount of \$500,000 found in the item now under consideration is an increase over that allowed a year ago?

Mr. LODGE. Last year it was \$600,000.

Mr. KING. May I inquire whether, in view of the exchange situation in Europe, the necessity exists for so large an appropriation as \$500,000?

Mr. LODGE. The House proposed \$250,000. That went out on a point of order, as most of the bill did, but the Senate committee thought that this was not an unreasonable amount.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think it would be better to put in \$250,000, because that is the amount which the committee in the House recommended?

Mr. MOSES. May I add, for further information, that in the readjustment which is bound to come immediately after the 4th of March, as we expect, there will be a considerable addition to the number of diplomatic and consular establishments which we shall have to maintain, and that accounted in very large measure for the increase which the Senate committee made over the sum allowed originally by the House committee and which the House itself struck out on a point of order.

All the establishments in central Europe, for instance, are now in a state of abeyance. There are also those new countries with which we have more or less nebulous relations at present, and with which we shall have to establish permanent relations, with consular corps scattered throughout the industrial communities, which was one thing brought before the committee that influenced me personally to appreciate the necessity for an increased appropriation under this head.

Mr. KING. May I inquire if in other parts of the bill adequate provision has not been made for consular agents and diplomatic representatives in all countries with which we had prior to the war diplomatic relations?

Mr. MOSES. The salaries are provided for in another place in the bill, but the salaries only. This, of course, as the Senator well knows, is in the nature of an extra allowance to enable those officers to supplement their salaries in order to meet the enhanced conditions of living under which they find themselves.

I agree with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] that this is simply a piece of stop-gap legislation, done by rule of thumb, which no one can possibly estimate; that it is unwise and in some respects imprudent; but it certainly is the part of wisdom and the part of justice for the Government and the De-

partment of State to care adequately for those representatives who find themselves in these foreign fields confronted by the conditions of living that there exist.

Mr. KING. May I inquire if the State Department had any difficulty in allocating the \$600,000 appropriated by the former bill?

Mr. MOSES. Does the Senator mean whether the \$600,000 was expended last year?

Mr. LODGE. I understand that it was expended.

Mr. KING. It was all allocated and all expended?

Mr. MOSES. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to repeat what the Senator from New Hampshire said in one respect. I am not at all in sympathy with this method of appropriating in legislation. This is one of the things that came over from the war. Europe is still in a distressed condition, and it is impossible to foresee many of the expenses. I hope that in another year these allowances to be made by the President will vanish from the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 21, to increase the appropriation for allowance for clerk hire at consulates from "\$1,200,000" to "\$1,800,000."

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether or not the evidence before the House committee justified a larger appropriation than \$1,200,000; and if not, what induced the Senate committee to make such a large increase?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is of great importance to the United States at the present time to do everything possible to extend its commerce. We hope there will be a great growth of business and trade in every direction, and it seemed to the committee, and the committee were unanimous upon it, that one place where we did not wish to make severe reductions was in the Consular Service; that we needed to keep that service in the highest state of efficiency. After considering the evidence which was before the other House and the action upon it there, the committee, as I have said, unanimously came to the conclusion that we ought to allow the amount estimated, and I think the sum proposed to be appropriated is the estimate.

I will now read some of the evidence on which we based our action. I do not desire to consume time, but the evidence makes the case clear. I now read the statement of Mr. Carr, who has been at the head of the Consular Service for many years. He stated:

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that this is a very large estimate, but it is based upon this principle: That as the service now stands it is running to its full capacity. We are utilizing our full \$1,200,000 clerk hire fund. We are still getting complaints from the offices now operating that have not enough clerk hire, and we are getting complaints from the Department of Commerce that we are not furnishing enough information.

We are receiving complaints from shipmasters and ship operators that the Consular Service is not furnishing sufficient service to them. These complaints are for the most part traceable to insufficient personnel to carry on the routine of the offices and give our consuls and vice consuls an opportunity to make trade investigations and do other things not now possible. We shall have soon to face a resumption of normal activities of the service in all parts of the world. Presumably we are going to have a state of peace shortly. In that event we shall have to establish at least 30 consulates in Germany; we shall have to establish consulates in Austria, in Hungary, in the Balkans, and in Turkey, in none of which are consulates functioning at the present moment. We shall have to supplement some of the seaport offices which are now functioning with additional clerks to keep the service up to a point where it can avoid complaints and criticism. That, in a rough outline, is the situation.

Mr. Carr was asked how many clerks they have now, and he said:

We have at present 986 clerks.

We want to bring that number up to approximately 1,340 clerks, at various compensations ranging in the main from \$3,000 down to below \$500. Of that total number which we now have, 400 are American citizens, drawing salaries of from \$400 to \$3,000—there is one as high as \$4,500, one at \$3,000, one at \$3,200, and one at \$3,120, these four cases where salaries above \$3,000 are paid are special and temporary.

Mr. ROGERS. About half, then, are American citizens?

Mr. CARR. Yes, sir. A little less than half are American citizens.

Mr. ROGERS. And are receiving \$1,000 and upward?

Mr. CARR. Yes, sir. Our plan is to utilize the increase, in the main, for American citizens.

Mr. ROGERS. The other half, which is not American, in every case receives less than \$1,000?

Mr. CARR. In every instance the foreigners receive less than \$1,000, with the exception of 10 persons who were in the service prior to the act of 1906. They are 10 very useful and experienced officials and are receiving more than \$1,000.

It is to be remembered that the Consular Service this year yielded to the Government a revenue of over \$2,000,000; it a great deal more than pays for itself. Next year, with the increased fees on passports and visés, it is estimated by the department that their net revenue will be over \$9,000,000, so that the

entire expense of the appropriation for the State Department will be more than paid by the fees which will be collected.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts whether Mr. Carr indicated in his testimony that he would like the amount which the Senate committee allowed?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; that is the estimate.

Mr. KING. If I may be pardoned, I wish to say that any recommendation made by Mr. Carr would be very persuasive with me, because Mr. Carr, I think, is one of the most efficient men in the State Department.

Mr. LODGE. He is one of the best officials in Washington, in my judgment.

Mr. KING. I think so, and he has devoted himself with the utmost zeal to the development of our foreign trade.

If I may trespass for one moment further, I desire to say that anything we may do to upbuild our Consular Service I am in favor of doing. I only think, if I may be pardoned for so stating, that the work of that service is being duplicated by the Department of Commerce. I prefer to build up the Consular Service rather than the Department of Commerce with respect to these matters.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Utah is absolutely right, and I am glad he feels in that way. This commercial attaché service, which has been gradually built up in the Department of Commerce, presents one of the instances of duplication by which the appropriations and the expenditures of the Government are so much increased.

Mr. KING. Absolutely.

Mr. LODGE. That work ought to be done by the Consular Service, and it can be so done. There is no need of having commercial attachés in more or less diplomatic capacities all over the world and having them report to another department. It simply causes confusion and more expenditures. The work can all be done under one department and ought to be so done.

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Massachusetts will formulate some measure which will consolidate that work, I shall give it my hearty approval. All I wish to say now is that when I want information respecting our foreign trade I go to the Department of State and not to the Department of Commerce, because in the latter department one can get but very little information.

Mr. LODGE. I hope and trust that that duplication will be done away with when we come to consider the reclassification bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment reported by the committee is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations was, on page 28, line 13, after the numerals "\$600,000," to insert the following proviso:

*Provided, That the provisions of the act approved May 22, 1918, shall, in so far as they relate to requiring passports and visés from aliens seeking to come to the United States, continue in force and effect until otherwise provided by law.*

Mr. LODGE. Before the committee amendment is acted upon, I desire to offer an amendment to the text immediately preceding, which was not embodied in the bill as reported. On page 28, after the word "and," in line 11, I move to strike out the words which follow down to and including the word "effective," in line 12, and to insert "in this act, to be immediately available."

The READING CLERK. On page 28, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "public act No. 79 of the Sixty-sixth Congress, when the latter act shall have become effective," and insert "in this act, to be immediately available."

Mr. LODGE. Then will follow the amendment reported by the committee, which appears in italic.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts what is the purpose of his amendment? I do not grasp it. The Senator moved to strike out certain words beginning in line 11, on page 28, and to insert some words in lieu thereof.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment offered by me was to strike out certain words in lines 11 and 12, as printed in the bill, so as to read:

*For expenses of regulating entry into the United States, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved May 22, 1918, and of this act, to be immediately available, \$600,000.*

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not familiar with public act No. 79, and I do not know what the limitations contained in that act are; but if we strike out the provision to which the Senator refers and merely make the appropriation in this act there will be no limitation.

Mr. LODGE. Public act No. 79 of the Sixty-sixth Congress simply extended the provisions of the act approved May 22, 1918. The bill we are now considering does the same thing.



Mr. UNDERWOOD. What I am trying to find out is what was the act that is extended? What is the purpose of this legislation?

Mr. LODGE. The purpose is to enable us to collect the passport and visé fees which were provided for in the act of May 22, 1918, and, in order to do that, we have to extend the provisions of that, which authorized the imposition of such fees.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The provision, then, as amended, will provide for the collection of the same fees that were fixed by the last piece of legislation on the subject?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; in the measure that we adopted last year. It is designed to prevent our losing such fees because of the expiration of the act.

Mr. HARRISON. I wish to ask the Senator a question along the same line. As I understand, the House has passed a separate bill extending act No. 79, or the previous act of May 22, 1918, as amended?

Mr. LODGE. As I understand, a bill extending public act No. 79 was reported, but I do not think it has been passed.

Mr. HARRISON. My recollection is that it has passed the House and is now before the Immigration Committee of the Senate. It extends the act which, unless action is taken, will, as I understand, expire on the 4th of March, 1921. It should be extended.

Mr. LODGE. It ought to be extended; yes.

Mr. HARRISON. This provision extends that act, does it?

Mr. LODGE. It only extends the act which applies to passport and visé fees.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator does not think it advisable and wise to add, as another proviso, the bill which has passed the House and is now before the Senate dealing with this question and extending the act?

Mr. LODGE. I think the provision in this bill extends the original act. It does what act No. 79 did. That is my understanding.

Mr. HARRISON. It is all right if it does that, because I think it should be extended.

Mr. LODGE. I say I think it does. The bill now provides:

For expenses of regulating entry into the United States, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved May 22, 1918, and of this act—

That is, the one we are now considering.

Mr. HARRISON. I have not had time to study the House bill which I have in mind.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will look up the proviso which we have added to the House text he will find that it reads:

That the provisions of the act approved May 22, 1918, shall, in so far as they relate to requiring passports and visés from aliens seeking to come to the United States, continue in force and effect until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. HARRISON. That should be adopted and the act should be extended—

Mr. LODGE. I think so.

Mr. HARRISON. Because it is one way of restricting immigration into this country at this particular time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the amendment which the Secretary has read inserting a proviso on page 28, beginning in line 13. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I move, on page 28, to strike out lines 18 to 21, inclusive, as the provision embodied in those lines has been made unnecessary by the adoption by the Senate of the clause in regard to the purchase of embassies and legations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 28, after line 17, it is proposed to strike out:

For such expenses, not otherwise provided for herein, as may be necessary to enable the President to conduct and maintain any embassy, legation, or consular office authorized by law, \$41,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations was, on page 28, after line 21, to insert:

#### PAYMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE.

For payment to the Government of France, as a matter of grace and without reference to the question of liability therefor, the sum of \$4,928 for full indemnity for losses suffered by Madame Crignier by reason of a search for the body of Admiral John Paul Jones, undertaken in 1899 by Gen. Horace Porter, at that time American ambassador to France, and completed by the finding of the body in 1905, as set forth in the message of the President of the United States to the Senate and the House of Representatives dated June 4, 1918.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I desire to inquire of the chairman of the committee if the amendment embodying the so-

called Crignier claim for damages in connection with the search for the body of John Paul Jones was reported favorably by the committee?

Mr. LODGE. The committee reported the amendment favorably.

Mr. KNOX. I did not think the committee had reported it favorably.

Mr. LODGE. I am sorry that is the Senator's impression. I understood the committee to vote for it.

Mr. KNOX. I am opposed to it. I opposed the claim in the committee; and I have an impression, although, of course, I shall not insist upon being positive about it—that is, I am positive about the impression, but I will not make any statement about the fact if the chairman of the committee says that the committee voted in favor of the claim—

Mr. LODGE. There was no roll call, I will say to the Senator, but I understood the committee to adopt it.

Mr. KNOX. On the assumption that the committee did adopt it, and that it is properly in the bill—and I do assume that—I, of course, have the right to oppose the claim on the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator desire to make a point of order?

Mr. KNOX. I will not resort to that. The United States had nothing to do with the excavations which were made in the effort to locate the bones of John Paul Jones. That was an enterprise undertaken by a very public-spirited gentleman by the name of Gen. Horace Porter. Gen. Horace Porter himself undertook to bear the expense of the search for the bones of that distinguished hero, perhaps aided by other high-minded and patriotic gentlemen who desired to have them brought to this country.

The facts in regard to this claim, as I understand them—and they did come to me in my capacity as Secretary of State some years ago—were that Mr. Horace Porter had entered into an agreement with the lady owning this house beneath whose foundations it was supposed they would have to excavate that he would pay her so many thousand francs—the number of francs I have now forgotten—for any damage that might result to her property by reason of this excavation, and the money was paid to her. As is usual in such cases, after the excavation had been made, and after the damages that were to result from this excavation had been paid for, the owner of the property discovered that a greater amount of damage than she had in contemplation at the time she received payment for prospective damages had been inflicted upon her property. Accordingly, instead of presenting a claim to Mr. Horace Porter, who had conducted the work upon his own responsibility, she proceeded, through diplomatic channels, to present a claim against the United States for three or four times as much as the estimated amount of the damage which had been paid to her.

Mr. President, there is no reason on earth why the people of the United States should assume this burden, unless it be for that reason which seems to underlie so many appropriations of public money, that it is another chance to give away the taxpayer's money for something with which the taxpayer had nothing to do.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not think there was any pretense that there is a legal claim in this matter. It was presented by the French Government in behalf of this lady on the ground that the damage, as the Senator from Pennsylvania says, had been much greater than was anticipated. Coming in that way, I understood that a majority of the committee thought it would be well to put it on the bill; but I quite understand the grounds of the objection made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I want to assure him that I did not intend to put in anything to which he had not agreed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations was, on page 29, after line 7, to insert:

#### FOR THE RELIEF OF THE CONTRIBUTORS TO THE ELLEN M. STONE RANSOM FUND.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to return to such contributors, or, in the event of the death of any such contributors, to the legal representatives thereof, as may file their claims within one year from the passage of this act, the money subscribed by such contributors to pay the ransom for the release of Miss Ellen M. Stone, an American missionary to Turkey, who was abducted by brigands on September 3, 1901, said total sum not to exceed \$66,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, this appropriation has been authorized by a vote of the Senate some four or five different times, and I have before me the favorable report of the House

Committee on Claims, Report No. 1398, Sixty-third Congress, third session, written by Congressman Pou. It contains the letter to the President by the then Secretary of State, Mr. Root. I ask that pages 1 and 2 and part of page 3 be incorporated in the RECORD for the information of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1864) for the relief of the contributors to the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass.

The object of this bill is to make an appropriation and authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to return the certain amounts contributed by the friends, churches, and other organizations throughout the United States to create a fund sufficient to secure the release of Miss Ella M. Stone, an American missionary to Turkey. She was captured by brigands on the 3d day of September, 1901, while in company with a small company of Turkish travelers on their way from Raslog to Djumabala, in the Empire of Turkey, and held for a ransom 172 days in the mountains of Bulgaria. Messrs. Kidder, Peabody & Co., bankers, of Boston, Mass., and custodians of the ransom fund, have furnished the committee with a list of the contributors, which is hereto appended and made a part of this report. Bills similar in import to this one have passed the Senate three times. Under date of March 26, 1908, President Roosevelt addressed a letter to the Senate and House of Representatives, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State, both of which are made a part of this report. Appended hereto is a letter from the President of the United States under date of October 7, 1914, and one from the Secretary of State under date of July 15, 1914, both of which are also made a part of this report.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a letter from the Secretary of State on the subject of the repayment to the contributors of the money raised to pay the ransom for the release of Miss Ellen M. Stone, an American missionary to Turkey, who was abducted by brigands on September 3, 1901, while traveling on the highway from Raslog to Djumabala in the Turkish Empire.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 26, 1908.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, March 24, 1908.

The PRESIDENT:

As will be remembered, Miss Ellen M. Stone, an American missionary to Turkey, was abducted by brigands on September 3, 1901, while traveling on the highway from Raslog to Djumabala in the Turkish Empire.

Our diplomatic and consular representatives in Turkey, in correspondence with the Department of State, shortly after the capture, indicated their belief that the motive therefor was to obtain a ransom, and stated that they had requested the Turkish officials to abstain from too close pursuit of the brigands lest the death of the captured might result.

From later correspondence with our representatives it appeared that the brigands had retired to the mountains with the captive, probably over the border into Bulgaria. The exact location of the party during the captivity, however, is not established by any evidence in the possession of the Department of State, nor does it appear clearly of what Government the bandits were subjects.

About October 1, 1901, the bandits opened negotiations for a ransom, demanding \$25,000 and transmitting a letter from Miss Stone asking that the sum demanded be paid and that pursuit of the brigands by the Turkish troops be stopped.

Our diplomatic representatives were of the opinion that Miss Stone's release could only be obtained by the payment of the ransom, and the State Department shared this view. Miss Stone's friends, of course, entered into correspondence with the department regarding the payment of the ransom and were told that it must be raised by private means.

On October 3, 1901, the State Department telegraphed to the Rev. Judson Smith, of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (this dispatch was forwarded subsequently by Dr. Smith to Mr. Charles A. Stone as "the proper custodian of this"). Boston, Mass., as follows:

"It seems imperative that the amount (of the ransom) should be raised or pledged so as to be available by your treasurer at Constantinople in season to save Miss Stone. Statutory prohibitions make it impossible for this Government to advance the money or guarantee its payment. If paid by Miss Stone's friends, every effort will be made to obtain reimbursement from whichever Government may be found responsible under international law and precedent. In the event of its proving impossible to hold any foreign Government responsible for the capture and to secure the repayment of the money, this Government is willing in the last resort to urge upon Congress as strongly as possible to appropriate money to repay the contributors."

It is claimed that this assurance given by the department in its letter to Mr. Smith, to the effect that, as a last resort, a recommendation would be made to Congress looking toward the appropriation of a sum sufficient to pay the donors, was largely instrumental in enabling Miss Stone's friends to secure the sum of \$66,000, which was raised through public subscription in this country by October 23, 1901, for the purpose of effecting Miss Stone's release.

After negotiations of considerable length, the brigands finally consented to accept the amount raised and arrangements were made by United States Minister Leishman for the payment of the money at a point near Bansko, Macedonia, the Turkish authorities consenting to withhold their troops from the vicinity of the place in order that the negotiations might have a successful issue.

The release of the captive was not obtained so soon as expected, but was finally reported by Minister Leishman on February 23, 1902.

After careful consideration of all the facts, my predecessor, Mr. Hay, decided on January 19, 1905, that it was not advisable to attempt to hold the Turkish Government responsible for the capture and to secure the repayment of the money. Upon the subsequent application for reconsideration of this decision, Mr. Hay, again on April 11, 1905, reaffirmed the judgment which he had originally expressed. Upon a further review of the same subject I have come to the conclusion that it is not advisable to reverse or change the conclusion which Mr. Hay reached.

It would seem, therefore, that the executive department is bound to make good its promise to recommend to Congress that money be appropriated to repay the ransom money, a promise which was probably relied upon by many of those who contributed of their private means to save the life of an American citizen believed to be in the gravest peril.

Accordingly, I have the honor to advise that Congress be recommended to appropriate an amount sufficient to repay the contributors.

Respectfully submitted,

ELIHU ROOT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, October 7, 1914.

MY DEAR MR. POUL: I am quite sure that it is not necessary to remind you of the bill before the Committee on Claims with regard to reimbursing those who contributed to the fund for the ransom of Miss Ellen M. Stone from the Turks, for I know that your committee has again and again approved the bill. I take the liberty, however, of sending you Miss Stone's letter to me. It gives me the opportunity to say how sincerely I hope that at the next session of Congress this bill may be passed.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Hon. EDWARD W. POUL,  
House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, July 15, 1914.

SIR: At the request of Miss Ellen M. Stone, the American missionary who was abducted by Turkish brigands in 1901, the department desires to call attention to the message of President Roosevelt to the Congress March 26, 1908, transmitting the letter of Secretary Root on the subject of repayment by the Government to the contributors of the money raised to pay the ransom for the release of Miss Stone, amounting to \$66,000. It appears that the Department of State announced in 1901, while Miss Stone was in the hands of the brigands, that if the ransom were raised and paid by private persons every effort would be made to obtain reimbursement from the Government which might be found responsible under international law, and, in the event of it proving impossible to hold any foreign Government responsible, the department was willing to urge that Congress appropriate money to repay the contributors. Subsequent investigation appeared to show the irresponsibility of any foreign Government, and therefore the department takes this occasion again to recommend that Congress make such appropriation. I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

W. J. BRYAN.

Hon. EDWARD W. POUL,  
Chairman Committee on Claims, House of Representatives.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, have the committee amendments been disposed of?

The VICE PRESIDENT. They have.

Mr. MOSES. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 29, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

For expenses of delegates, not exceeding 10 in number, to be designated by the President, to the Sixteenth International Congress Against Alcoholism at Lausanne, Switzerland, August, 1921, not to exceed \$7,425, to be paid out of the unexpended balance of the appropriations heretofore made for the Fifteenth International Congress Against Alcoholism, said amount including secretarial and stenographic work and transcription of reports.

Mr. LODGE. That carries no appropriation; and as far as I can, on behalf of the committee, I am very glad to accept it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAPPER. I call up the amendment which I offered to the item for the support of the International Institute of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 14, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "\$3,600," and in lieu thereof to insert the following: "\$7,500; secretary, \$2,500; traveling expenses, \$2,500."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. On page 15, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$16,600," and in lieu thereof to insert "\$25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Is that the Lubin job over at Rome?

Mr. CAPPER. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He is dead.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to make a point of order on that.

Mr. CAPPER. This simply increases the amount.

Mr. SMOOT. I know it does.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not estimated for.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, it is estimated for.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought when Mr. Lubin died we would have at least that much saved. I shall not say anything more about it, however.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.



The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives upon the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. LODGE, Mr. BORAH, and Mr. HITCHCOCK conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up the deficiency appropriation bill, H. R. 15962.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### APPOINTMENT OF ORDNANCE STOREKEEPER IN THE ARMY.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Wyoming if he will be kind enough to lay aside the deficiency bill in order that I may call up a very short bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, which I think will lead to no discussion and no debate?

Mr. WARREN. No, Mr. President; I can not lay the bill aside. If the Senator's bill, as he says, is short and will not lead to debate, I have no objection to his trying to get it passed now.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 4912, to authorize the appointment of an ordnance storekeeper in the Army. It has been reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. It is just half a dozen lines long and will not lead to any debate. The passage of the bill is recommended by the War Department.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if this is the bill creating the position of ordnance storekeeper in order to give a man a position in the Army?

Mr. KING. Yes; that is it.

Mr. NELSON. No; this bill refers to a man who has been for over 43 years ordnance clerk in the War Department and has rendered faithful and efficient service. He has never taken his annual leave; he has oftentimes worked Sundays; and this is to put him on the retired list, and immediately retire him, and give him the pay of a retired captain.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that is half of it, Mr. President, but I think the other half is to give a position to another officer, is it not?

Mr. NELSON. It does not increase the Army a bit. He is to be immediately retired. I trust the Senator will make no objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not the figures now, but I am getting them together, as to just what our Government is paying for retired officers of the Army and the Coast Guard and the Navy. I will say now that the figures are going to be staggering, and I want the Senate of the United States to understand just what they are. We have on the calendar now another bill proposing to retire certain other officers, and after a while we will get to retiring employees and paying them three-quarters salary, and eventually there will be nobody to pay taxes. I do not know that I shall object to the consideration of the bill, however.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4912) to authorize the appointment of an ordnance storekeeper in the Army, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with amendments.

The amendments were, on line 3, after the words "authorized to," to strike out "nominate and"; on line 4, after the word "appoint," to insert "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate"; and on line 8, after the words "pay and," to strike out "allowance" and insert "allowances," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the President is hereby authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Nathan Hazen, chief clerk, Office of the Chief of Ordnance Department, United States Army,

an ordnance storekeeper of the Ordnance Department, United States Army, with the rank and pay and allowances of a captain, mounted, and that he be immediately placed upon the retired list.

The grade of ordnance storekeeper is hereby revived in the Army of the United States for this purpose only.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 2, to insert:

#### BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY.

To enable the Bureau of Efficiency to perform the duties imposed upon it by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved May 29, 1920, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2, after line 6, it is proposed to insert a separate paragraph, to read:

Executive office: The accounting officers of the District of Columbia are authorized to pay J. Thilman Hendrick the salary of a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for the period he entered upon the duties of that office to and including March 4, 1921, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1761 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 2, after the amendment just agreed to, to insert:

#### GENERAL EXPENSES.

District of Columbia employees' compensation fund: For carrying out the provisions of section 11 of the District of Columbia appropriation act, approved July 11, 1919, extending to the employees of the government of the District of Columbia the provisions of the act approved September 7, 1916, entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 20, to insert:

Coroner's office: For purchase and maintenance, hire of livery or means of transportation for the coroner's office and the morgue, jurors' fees, witness fees, removal of deceased persons, making autopsies, ice, disinfectants, telephone service, and other necessary supplies for the morgue, and the necessary expenses of holding inquests, including stenographic services in taking testimony, and photographing unidentified bodies, \$1,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 3, to insert:

For advertising notice of taxes in arrears July 1, 1920, as required to be given by act of March 19, 1890, to be reimbursed by a charge of 50 cents for each lot or piece of property advertised, \$2,200: *Provided*, That hereafter no more than 1,000 copies of the pamphlet of taxes in arrears shall be printed, and a charge of not less than cost plus 10 per centum shall be made and collected from each person furnished with a copy of such pamphlet, the moneys to be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the revenues of the United States and the District of Columbia in the same proportions as appropriations for printing the pamphlet are paid from such revenues.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 15, to insert:

#### SEWERS.

For operation and maintenance of the sewage-pumping service, including repairs to boilers, machinery, and pumping stations, and employment of mechanics, laborers, and two watchmen, purchase of coal, oils, waste, and other supplies, and for maintenance of motor trucks, \$18,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 22, to insert:

#### PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Allowance to principals: For allowance to principals of grade school buildings for services rendered as such, in addition to their grade salary to be paid in strict conformity with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, \$2,980.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 18, to insert:

#### METROPOLITAN POLICE.

For maintenance of motor vehicles, \$1,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 20, to insert:

FIRE DEPARTMENT.

For repairs and improvements of fire boat, \$700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 23, to insert:

HEALTH DEPARTMENT.

For enforcement of the provisions of an act to provide for the drainage of lots in the District of Columbia, approved May 19, 1896, and an act to provide for the abatement of nuisances in the District of Columbia by the commissioners, and for other purposes, approved April 14, 1906, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 3, to insert:

For contingent expenses incident to the enforcement of an act to regulate the sale of milk in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 2, 1895; an act relating to the adulteration of foods and drugs in the District of Columbia, approved February 17, 1898; an act to prevent the adulteration of candy in the District of Columbia, approved May 5, 1898; an act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes, approved June 30, 1906, \$400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 14, to insert:

For the maintenance of a dispensary or dispensaries for the treatment of persons suffering from tuberculosis and of persons suffering from venereal diseases, including payment for personal service, rent, and supplies, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 18, to insert:

COURTS.

Juvenile court: For transportation and traveling expenses to secure the return of absconding probationers, \$150.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 5, in the items for support of convicts, to change the appropriation from "\$50,000" to "\$25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 2, to insert:

CHARITIES AND CORRECTIONS.

Home for the Aged and Infirm: For provisions, fuel, forage, harness, and vehicles and repairs to same, ice, shoes, clothing, dry goods, tailoring, drugs and medical supplies, furniture and bedding, kitchen utensils, and other necessary items, including maintenance of motor trucks, \$5,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 8, to insert:

Board of Children's Guardians: For administrative expenses, including placing and visiting children, city directory, purchase of books of reference and periodicals not exceeding \$25, and all office and sundry expenses, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 12, to insert:

For maintenance of feeble-minded children (white and colored), \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 14, to insert:

For board and care of all children committed to the guardianship of said board by the courts of the District, and for temporary care of children pending investigation or while being transferred from place to place, with authority to pay not more than \$7,500 (in lieu of \$1,500 heretofore authorized) to institutions adjudged to be under sectarian control and not more than \$400 for burial of children dying while under charge of the board, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 22, to insert:

Hospital for the Insane: For support of indigent insane of the District of Columbia in St. Elizabeths Hospital, as provided by law, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 8, to insert:

Deportation of nonresident insane: For deportation of nonresident insane persons, in accordance with the act of Congress "to change the proceedings for admission to the Government Hospital for the Insane in certain cases, and for other purposes," approved January 31, 1899, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 5, to insert:

JUDGMENTS.

For payment of the judgments, including costs, against the District of Columbia, set forth in Senate Document No. 394 of the present session, \$5,373.95, together with a further sum to pay the interest at not exceeding 4 per cent per annum on said judgments, as provided by law, from the date they became due until the date of payment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 23, to strike out:

Valuation of property of carriers: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the objects of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof," by providing for a

valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year, \$1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 12, to insert:

For transportation of diplomatic and consular officers, including the same objects specified under this head in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 21, to insert:

The limitation for the fiscal year 1921 as to the number of delivered sheets of customs stamps is increased from 276,000 to 520,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 13, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

To pay the American Express Co. the sum of \$470.80 due for transportation of currency, as authorized by the act of May 30, 1908, the appropriation for which expired by limitation before the bills for these shipments had been settled, \$470.80.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 22, to insert:

PAYMENT TO WALSTON H. BROWN AND OTHERS.

To pay Walston H. Brown, sole surviving partner of the firm of Brown, Howard & Co., \$65,792.53; to the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co., \$26,400.30; and to the estate of Henry A. V. Post, \$50,359.35, as adjudged by the Court of Claims upon its findings of fact.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 15, to insert:

For reimbursement of John M. Rogers, paying teller in the Office of the Assistant Treasurer at Chicago, Ill., for amounts made good by him on account of losses incurred in the payment of disbursing officer's checks upon indorsements which were later found to have been forged, \$315.44.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 19, to increase the appropriation for expenses to enforce the provisions of the national prohibition act, etc., from "\$1,000,000" to "\$1,450,000."

Mr. WARREN. We put in this amendment exactly what was asked for, and what was estimated, but we have decided to reduce the amount from \$1,450,000 to \$1,400,000. So that should be made \$1,400,000 instead of \$1,450,000, on line 19, page 15.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On line 19, page 15, reduce the amount to be inserted by striking out "\$1,450,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,400,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 2, to increase the appropriation for refunding taxes illegally collected from "\$1,000,000" to "\$4,435,000."

Mr. WARREN. In the amendment on page 16, line 2, before the numerals "\$4,435,000," I move to strike out the word "to."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed to line 7, page 18, the last paragraph read being as follows:

Prevention of epidemics: To enable the President, in case only of threatened or actual epidemic of cholera, typhus fever, yellow fever, smallpox, bubonic plague, Chinese plague or black death, trachoma, influenza, or infantile paralysis, to aid State and local boards, or otherwise, in his discretion, in preventing and suppressing the spread of the same, and in such emergency in the execution of any quarantine laws which may be then in force, \$450,000: *Provided*, That a detailed report of the expenditures hereunder shall annually hereafter be submitted to Congress.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the paragraph just read provides for an appropriation of \$450,000, under the title of "Prevention of epidemics." I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if this appropriation is for money already contracted for, or is it to take care of emergencies which may occur.

Mr. WARREN. I do not understand that the payment of a dollar has been contracted for, but I understand this is to provide a fund for meeting any emergencies which may arise.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the reason why I made the inquiry of the Senator from Wyoming was because a great deal of publicity has been given in the newspapers in the last day or two to some typhus cases coming into the port of New York on steamers from Europe, and I have had a request from the Public Health Service to ask for an appropriation of \$200,000 for the purpose of making some alterations, extensions, and improvements in the quarantine station in New York. As the chairman of the committee knows, that quarantine station was formerly conducted by the State of New York, and was handed over to the Public Health Service of the United States yesterday, and they seem to think it is inadequate. I desire to ask the Senator from Wyoming if he has had any communication from the Treasury Department concerning that?



Mr. WARREN. I have had no communication concerning it. The matter would not be in order at this time, and I may say to the Senator that Congress has never failed to respond in any emergency or when there was any epidemic. I will say further to the Senator that I know, from the feeling of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, that in any emergency of that kind we would take up a resolution and pass it, and the House would probably do the same, as we did a few days ago when a deficiency of a million dollars was passed in an hour through both Houses.

Mr. CALDER. I am only anxious to have it made clear, because I have been in receipt of a number of communications in the last day or two from New York, and there is some fear of this epidemic spreading.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator has shown me the letter from the Public Health Service, and the Surgeon General has evidently satisfied himself, by a survey, perhaps, that certain additions and improvements should be made. But they are not connected especially with any emergency or any disease. On taking over the quarantine station from the State of New York, he wants to make some changes, just as every housekeeper does when taking over a house which some one else has occupied. I do not believe it is in any case an emergency, and, of course, it is in no case a deficiency.

So I trust the Senator will not offer it, as I shall have to make the point of order.

Mr. CALDER. I shall not offer it, particularly in view of the fact that the Treasury Department has made no request for it.

Mr. WARREN. I will say that letters are continuing to come from the Treasury Department, but nothing has occurred to cause a change, and we have read every one of them up to this time as fast as they could be printed, and some that were not printed.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, in regard to what the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] has said, let me say that a few moments ago I talked with Commissioner Wallace, and he was speaking about the necessity of the Federal Government taking over the quarantine regulations instead of their being in the hands of the State authorities, in order to secure concentration and unity of management, both with regard to the question of quarantine and with regard to the work of the health bureau, and also with regard to examinations at Ellis Island. The commissioner regarded such action as most important to meet the present emergency.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 10, to increase the appropriation for repairs to Coast Guard cutters from "\$75,000" to "\$425,000" and to add: "including not more than \$300,000 for rebuilding the Coast Guard cutter *Onondaga*, so as to read:

For repairs to Coast Guard cutters, \$425,000, including not more than \$300,000 for rebuilding the Coast Guard cutter *Onondaga*.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 7, to insert:

Payment to the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co.: For payment of the claims for damage to and loss of private property occasioned by the explosions and fire at the plant of the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co., at Morgan, N. J., which have been determined by the Secretary of War and agreed to by the claimants and in amounts not exceeding those enumerated in the letter of the Secretary of War as submitted to Congress at the present session in Senate Document No. 363, \$285,141.41.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 20, to insert:

CHICKAMAUGA AND CHATTANOOGA NATIONAL MILITARY PARK.

For the restoration of "Bond Bridge," located on the Government MacLemore Cove Road, which is a highway included in the authorized roads of the park system, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 23, to insert:

PAYMENT TO LEAVENWORTH BRIDGE CO.

To pay the Leavenworth Bridge Co., of the city of Leavenworth, Kans., the sum of \$30,843.45 in settlement for extra expense in the building of the bridge across the Republican River at Fort Riley, Kans., such extra expense being the increased cost of labor due to direct Government competition in the local labor market and overhead costs during the period subsequent to the original completion date, which extra was required because such labor as was available was incompetent.

Mr. SMOOT. Referring to the claim in the amendment just read and the claims in amendments immediately following, I wish to say that I am not going to make a point of order against the amendments, that I will let them go through this time, but if the House agrees to them I shall endeavor to have a general law passed that will cover all similar cases.

Mr. KENYON. If we are going to open the door to claims of this kind, can the Senator estimate at all what the expenses will be?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think there is a person living who can do that. If the House agrees to these matters, then I know of many other claims, of course, that I shall want to have taken care of. I think, perhaps, there should be a general law covering the whole question, but as a majority of the committee have agreed to the claims, I am not going to say anything further until after the conference report is made.

Mr. WARREN. Referring to the remarks of the Senator from Utah and to the inquiry of the Senator from Iowa, of course we should enact a law to do away with these claims, but heretofore we have provided for certain classes of war claims occurring on account of certain transactions if made within certain dates. For instance, in the matter of public buildings, post offices, and courthouses, we passed a law that contracts should all be taken care of and considered by the authorities, and that we would make good to the extent of the exact cost of those that were contracted for just before the war increase in the prices of commodities, where the bids were made before the war but accepted afterwards. In that law we provided that they would consider only those claims that were presented within 90 days, I think it was, so that it was intended only to provide for a certain few, relief for all of which we expected would be applied for.

We have appropriated under that legislation, I think, \$1,500,000 perhaps, but we seem to be getting about to the end of those claims, as we are with reference to the Gillespie claims and others. There were certain levee and river and harbor claims, but I hope we have reached about the end of those. I should be glad to join with the Senators who have spoken of it, and other Senators, in legislating all this twilight zone out of existence, so that we may come back to exact contracts and exact conformance with contracts.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I voted against this claim in the committee and I shall vote against it now. I wish to be in a position to vote against all claims of this kind in the future. I do not wish to be bound by any precedent in voting for this claim. I realize that there is possibly something to be said in its favor, but note the words of the bill and effect of having those go out to the country as evidence that Congress is recognizing claims of this character. I read:

Such extra expense being the increased cost of labor due to direct Government competition in the local labor market and overhead costs during the period subsequent to the original completion date, which extra was required because such labor as was available was incompetent.

It seems to me there is absolutely no end to the claims that will be presented in the future by those who have done any Government work if the reasons given here are sufficient to pay a claim of this character.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the Senator if he can see any difference between this claim and the claim of a private individual for performing a contract that he had made, the cost of which was increased by reason of Government competition in the neighborhood?

Mr. KENYON. No; not at all. Every person who performed any contract with the Government and got the worst of the matter because of incompetency of labor or because of governmental competition has a claim that he can present here in the future and have this precedent for its payment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 10, to insert:

RIVER AND HARBOR WORK.

For payment of claims adjusted and settled under section 4 of the river and harbor appropriation act approved June 25, 1910, and section 9 of the river and harbor act approved June 5, 1920, and certified to Congress during the present session in Senate Document No. 378, \$1,200.11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 16, to insert:

Readjustment of contracts: For amounts found to be due various contractors under the provisions of section 10, river and harbor act approved March 2, 1919, on certain contracts for work on river and harbor improvements entered into but not completed prior to April 6, 1917, for work performed between April 6, 1917, and July 18, 1918, as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 384, reported to Congress at its present session, \$362,140.98.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 24, to insert:

Payment to Roach, Stansell, Lowrance Bros. & Co.: To pay the sum of \$204,307.93 to Roach, Stansell, Lowrance Bros. & Co., of which \$150,110.07 is for themselves, and \$14,953.84 is for the use and benefit of their subcontractors, L. Lowrance & Bros.; \$5,376 is for the use and benefit of the estate of their subcontractor, George F. Ramsey, and \$15,822.82 is for the use and benefit of their subcontractor, Rodgers Construction Co., and \$18,045.25 is for the use and benefit of their subcontractors, H. N. Rodgers & Bro., being the aggregate losses incurred by said Roach, Stansell, Lowrance Bros. &

Co. and their subcontractors in the carrying out of certain contracts referred to in a Senate resolution of June 19, 1919, under which the Secretary of War was directed to report the amount of losses incurred by the contractors upon contracts mentioned in said resolution: *Provided*, That before paying said sums the Secretary of the Treasury shall require satisfactory evidence that said contracts have been completed, and that there are no other subcontractors who claim loss for work in connection with said contracts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 20, to insert:

Payment to H. B. Blanks: To pay H. B. Blanks, levee contractor, the sum of \$123,569.03, of which \$40,720.95 is for the use and benefit of his subcontractors, Roach, Stansell, Lowrance Bros. & Co., and \$82,848.08 is for the use and benefit of the estate of his subcontractor, George F. Ramsey, being the aggregate losses incurred by said subcontractors in the carrying out of certain contracts referred to in a Senate resolution of June 19, 1919, under which the Secretary of War was directed to report the amount of losses incurred by the contractors upon contracts mentioned in said resolution: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury, before paying said sums, shall require evidence satisfactory to him that said contracts have been completed and that there are no other subcontractors who claim loss for work in connection therewith.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 10, to insert:

Payment to the estate of George F. Ramsey: To pay the sum of \$15,561.23 to the estate of George F. Ramsey, levee contractor, of which \$13,602.27 is for the estate of George F. Ramsey and \$1,958.96 is for the use and benefit of W. H. Dennison, his subcontractor, being the aggregate losses incurred by said George F. Ramsey and his subcontractors in the carrying out of certain contracts referred to in a Senate resolution of June 19, 1919, under which the Secretary of War was directed to report the amount of losses incurred by the contractors upon contracts mentioned in said resolution: *Provided*, That before paying said sums the Secretary of the Treasury shall require satisfactory evidence that said contract has been completed and that there are no other subcontractors who claim loss for work in connection with said contract.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 5, to increase the appropriation for pay of the Army from "\$24,000,000" to "\$30,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 5, to insert:

For the payment to the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co., as recommended in the report made to Congress under date of February 11, 1916, by the commission appointed under the act of June 24, 1914, and approved by the governor of the Panama Canal (H. Doc. No. 900, 64th Cong., 1st sess.), \$714,007.39, said amount to be chargeable as part of the construction of the Panama Canal and reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the proceeds of the sale of the bonds authorized by section 8 of the act approved June 28, 1902, and section 39 of the tariff act approved August 5, 1909.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 15, in the items for Eastern Branch, Togus, Me., National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, for household, to increase the appropriation from "\$36,000" to "\$54,000," and in line 19, to increase the total from "\$64,500" to "\$82,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 22, in the items for the Southern Branch, Hampton, Va., to increase the appropriation for subsistence from "\$57,000" to "\$76,500"; in line 23, for household, from "\$80,000" to "\$95,000"; and in line 27, to increase the total from "\$208,500" to "\$243,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 5, to change the total for National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers from "\$610,000" to "\$663,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 5, to insert:

So much as may be necessary of that part of the \$48,000,000 appropriated in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921 for medical and hospital services of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance allotted to the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers is hereby made available for the erection of 19 sets of double quarters at not exceeding \$10,000 each for the medical staff at the various branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 6, to insert the following proviso:

*Provided*, That the sum of \$1,700,000 is hereby transferred from the appropriation "Provisions, Navy" to the appropriation "Maintenance, Supplies and Accounts," for the fiscal year 1921, and the limitation specified for pay of classified employees under the latter appropriation is correspondingly increased.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 6, after the numerals "\$30,000,000" to insert:

*Provided*, That the sum of \$1,700,000 is hereby transferred from the appropriation "Provisions, Navy" to the appropriation "Maintenance, supplies and accounts," for the fiscal year 1921, and the limitation specified for pay of classified employees under the latter appropriation is correspondingly increased.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 11, to insert:

That deficiencies under appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year 1920 and prior years shall be charged to a naval supply account fund, which is hereby established, and to which shall be transferred the unexpended balances of annual appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal years 1919 and 1920, after two years from the expiration of the fiscal year for which made, and, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount equal to the value of all stores in the naval supply account on March 31, 1921, preliminary adjustments on account of stores to be made upon the certificate of the Secretary of the Navy that stores to the value certified are on hand; and from and after said date the naval supply account fund shall be charged with the cost of all stores procured for and credited with the value of all issues or sales made from the naval supply account, necessary adjustments being made on account of outstanding contracts or orders.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 5, to strike out "For" and insert "The sum of \$5,000,000 of the appropriation 'Maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps,' for the fiscal year 1919 is hereby reappropriated and made available for," and in line 12 to strike out the numerals "\$5,000,000," so as to read:

Freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: The sum of \$5,000,000 of the appropriation "Maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps," for the fiscal year 1919 is hereby reappropriated and made available for all freight and express charges pertaining to the Navy Department and its bureaus, except the transportation of coal for the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, for the fiscal year 1921.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 16, to insert:

The prices at which material is to be expended from the naval-supply account shall be fixed by the Paymaster General of the Navy, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, and materials purchased during the war shall be issued at reduced prices in all cases appropriate, such differences in values and losses to be charged to the respective funds; and hereafter no charges on this account shall be made to naval appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 3, to insert:

The sum of \$3,000,000 of the appropriation "Maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps," for the fiscal year 1920 is hereby reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1921 under the following subheads:

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if this is not really an additional appropriation rather than a transfer of the appropriation heretofore made for "Maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps"? On the preceding page, from the unexpended balance of the appropriation for "Maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps," the sum of \$5,000,000 is reappropriated and made available for "Freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts" of the Navy Department. They must have had an unexpended balance; but is not this really increasing the appropriation?

Mr. WARREN. Oh, no. The Senator from Utah would readily understand it if he should sit down with a pencil and figure it up. For instance, in line 12, on page 35, the committee has reported to strike out \$5,000,000. That amount is stricken out in one place and reappropriated in another place. It is not additional appropriation, and we are not thereby giving any more money. In other words, from prior appropriations of \$120,000,000 there remained \$8,000,000 which could be used in reducing the several amounts which the House had sent over here. We had to divide it in the way indicated, after conference with the admiral who has charge of the maintenance of the service, according to the various accounts, so as to leave the appropriation clear in the accounts as they are carried on the books.

The Navy Department asked for about one hundred and ninety-odd million dollars, practically \$200,000,000. The House had provided for something like \$61,000,000. The item was presented to them before they finished the bill, but they left it with the Senate to provide something like a needed \$110,000,000 by some legislation which it was thought might be inserted in the Senate, but which, according to the rules under which the House is working and the confusion existing there, could not be put in by them. They were willing for us to put it in. So we put in this amount, but took it out of the appropriations heretofore made, which show a surplus or an unexpended balance.

It is a clean-up, for that matter, of one hundred and twenty-odd million dollars which has heretofore been appropriated and not used to cover all of these items. So we are using only something like \$50,000,000 of new money appropriated instead of \$190,000,000.

The Senator from Utah has to take into consideration three or four pages of the bill in order to get the matter together.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Wyoming says that we have \$5,000,000 out of the item for "Freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," by striking out \$5,000,000 in line 12, on page 35. The only thing that I see which comes from striking out



\$5,000,000 in that line is the insertion of \$5,000,000 in line 6, as the committee amendment proposes.

Mr. WARREN. It is simply a transference, as the Senator will see if he will read it, and not an appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. I am aware of that, but it is making that sum available for the freight expenses of the Navy Department.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator from Utah is objecting to the amount that the department has asked for, of course we shall have to discuss it on that basis; but we made a gain in this case in the current funds by using the \$120,000,000 in cutting down or filling the vacuum that the House expected us to fill in the appropriation. We thought it better to exhaust those unused items, as has been partially done, or entirely done, perhaps, in the case of the Army, and to cut down the live amounts that much.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not yet see it. It looks to me like an appropriation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if we strike out the clause from line 4 to line 7, on page 36 of the bill, and leave it as provided in the bill as it came from the other House, would not the same amount go to the Marine Corps which would go with those lines in?

Mr. WARREN. I do not catch the Senator's question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If we strike out lines 4 to 7, inclusive, on page 36, would not the same amount be appropriated under the heading "Maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps," as would be appropriated if we put those lines in? There would be exactly the same amount of money appropriated.

Mr. WARREN. Exactly the same amount.

Mr. SMOOT. But this is for the year 1921.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I know that; but this is what I am coming to: I understand that bookkeeping and I am not complaining of the committee, because I know how it is done. I know that last year the committee carried over and reappropriated a very large amount of money from old unexpended appropriations, so that when the balance sheet was struck they did not stand as appropriations for that year. I am perfectly willing that it shall be done in that way; but now that the election is over and it will be a long time before another election, I think we might just as well balance the books.

Exactly the same amount is coming out of the Treasury whether we include the words at the top of page 36 or not. This unused balance has lapsed back into the Treasury; it is not available now; and it does not make any difference whether we say we appropriate the amount out of a sum that has lapsed back into the Treasury or whether we provide it as an original appropriation; it is exactly the same charge on the Treasury of the United States, except as a matter of bookkeeping. I have not any objection to the committee doing its bookkeeping, I will say to the chairman of the committee, in its own way; I am not criticizing the chairman of the committee; I know that each party wants to hold down its appropriations, and before elections we have to keep our books with that end in view; but I think it is just that the record should show that these reappropriations are really appropriations out of the Treasury. I do not think the Republican Party ought to be charged with anything more than the money they have spent, but they are the party in power; they are responsible and should assume the responsibility of the money they do spend. This amount of money is coming out of the Treasury no matter how this bill is written. I think we ought to recognize that fact and the record ought to show it. That is the only purpose I had in rising, for I have no doubt that the appropriations are all right and proper.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I will say that the thought of political parties in connection with this matter, or that there could be any attempt to secure political advantage because of the transfer of these various amounts as provided in the bill, never entered my head. It seems to me, however, that the Treasury would be in better condition and the Secretary of the Treasury would be able to work better if, so to speak, the house were cleaned up and he knew what is appropriated for the uses of the Government, rather than that appropriations should lie over, subject to be called upon at any minute, and driving him out to borrow money.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to that, I will say to the Senator, except as to the old appropriations. They have lapsed; they were only continued for the last year. I merely want the record to show that the Treasury is chargeable with this money.

Mr. WARREN. Some of the past appropriations for the Navy were available until expended; but I am willing to say that the Navy Department has run behind and has asked for deficiencies amounting to nearly \$200,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that is right; and I think that is what ought to be said, Mr. President. I should like also to say that if we

had time I would insist upon finding out the exact balances remaining from all appropriations which were made during the war and which were to remain available until expended. Then I think it would be wise to repeal those laws and have every dollar of the unexpended appropriations go back into the Treasury of the United States. In that way every dollar appropriated from now on would be appropriated for the fiscal year in which it was to be expended.

I do not know how many hundreds of millions of dollars are yet left over in the War Department. The appropriations were made without limit, not only for the War Department but for the Navy Department. I recognize that there is not time to do what I suggest at the short session of Congress, but that is what ought to be done in the case of the War Department, and that is what I think will be done in the case of the Navy Department in the fortifications appropriation bill. So long as there is an unexpended balance, I do not care in what year the appropriation was made, if it is provided in connection with the appropriation that it shall remain available to be expended at any time until the full amount is used, then that fund is there, and the head of the department can get hold of it and can have it transferred from year to year, so that it may be available during any given fiscal year. I think that ought to cease now that the war is over.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agree with the Senator that it might have been justified during war conditions; but the Senator is exactly right about it. If we are going to control the appropriations, we ought to know where they are; but I think the Senator will find that in the acts that we passed right after the war ceased we converted a large number of these items back into the Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. We converted about \$645,000,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. More than that; a good deal more than that—something over a billion dollars.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I think that is true, as I recall now; but we have not done it in the case of all of them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think we have.

Mr. SMOOT. Take the case of the Navy: I asked Gen. Lord this afternoon to furnish me with the exact amount of all of the unexpended balances there were in the Navy Department. Whatever those unexpended balances are, I want to have a repealing provision enacted, providing that they shall go back to the credit of the United States, so that there shall not remain on the statute books hereafter any of these appropriations made in years past to be expended whenever the heads of the department desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head "Department of the Interior," on page 37, after line 18, to insert:

#### CONTINGENT EXPENSES.

For stationery, including the same objects specified under this head in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 16, to insert:

#### INDIAN SERVICE.

For support of Indian day, boarding, and industrial schools, including the same objects specified under this head in the Indian appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$290,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 21, to insert:

To pay audited claims found due by the accounting officers of the Treasury for the fiscal years as follows:

Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1918, \$8,058.47.  
 Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1919, \$79,584.57.  
 Purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1920, \$153,515.53.  
 Support of Chippewas of Lake Superior, Wis., 1919, \$11.51.  
 Support of Chippewas of Lake Superior, Wis., 1920, \$259.70.  
 Support of Indians, Blackfeet Agency, Mont., 1918-19, \$69.96.  
 Support of Indians, Blackfeet Agency, Mont., 1920, \$15.43.  
 Support of Indians of Colville, etc., Agencies, and Joseph's Band of Nez Percés, Washington, 1919, 88 cents.  
 Support of Indians, Fort Peck Agency, Mont., 1920, \$8.51.  
 Support of Kickapoos, Oklahoma, 1920, 98 cents.  
 Support of Pawnees, employees, etc., Oklahoma, 1919, \$18.56.  
 Indian school, Carson City, Nev., 1919, \$12.21.  
 Indian school, Carson City, Nev., irrigation system, 1920, \$348.65.  
 Indian school, Carson City, Nev., sewerage system, 1920, \$95.78.  
 Indian school, Fort Mojave, Ariz., 1919, \$32.04.  
 Indian school, Genoa, Nebr., 1919, \$91.53.  
 Indian school, Greenville, Calif., 1919, \$3.70.  
 Indian school, Cherokee, N. C., repairs and improvements, 1920, \$1,813.92.  
 Indian school, Phoenix, Ariz., repairs and improvements, 1919, \$104.50.  
 Indian school, Riverside, Calif., repairs and improvements, 1919, \$10.50.  
 Indian school, Pipestone, Minn., 1920, \$405.26.

Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., 1919, \$73.13.  
 Improvement, maintenance, and operation, irrigation system, Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho, reimbursable, 1920, \$881.78.  
 Irrigation near Jemez and Zia Pueblos, N. Mex., 1920, \$164.65.  
 Irrigation project, ceded lands, Wind River Reservation, Wyo., reimbursable, 1919, \$15.09.  
 Irrigation system, Blackfoot Reservation, Mont., reimbursable, 1920, \$169.61.  
 Maintenance and operation, irrigation system, Yakima Reservation, Wash., reimbursable, 1920, \$139.81.  
 Maintenance and operation, Ganado Irrigation project, Navajo Reservation, Ariz., reimbursable, 1920, \$101.96.  
 Maintenance and operation, pumping plant, San Xavier Reservation, Ariz., reimbursable, 1920, \$347.52.  
 Maintenance and operation, water works, Papago Indian villages, Arizona, 1920, \$9.79.  
 Surveying and allotting, Indian reservations, reimbursable, 1920, \$1,411.50.  
 Water supply Navajo and Hopi Indians, Arizona, reimbursable, 1918-19, \$2.94.  
 Water supply, Navajo and Hopi Indians, Arizona, reimbursable, 1920, \$3,000.  
 Water supply, Papago Indian villages, Arizona, 1920, \$152.56.  
 Highway from Mesa Verde National Park to Gallup, N. Mex., reimbursable, 1920, \$652.68.  
 Toppenish and Simcoe Creeks Irrigation System, Yakima Reservation, Wash., reimbursable, 1920, \$4,000.  
 Suppressing contagious diseases among live stock of Indians (no year), \$3,000.  
 In all, \$258,585.21.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, on page 41, line 16, I move to strike out the words "no year" and the parentheses.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 17, to insert:

To pay the Pawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma in full and final settlement for the purchase by the United States of 169,368.02 acres of surplus land belonging to said Pawnee Tribe, under the act of Congress approved March 3, 1893 (27th Stats., pp. 612-644), the sum of \$312,811.27, with interest thereon from September 3, 1920, at the rate of 5 per cent per annum as provided in said act of Congress of March 3, 1893, and in pursuance of the findings of the Court of Claims of December 6, 1920, as set forth in Senate Document No. 311, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, \$312,811.27.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 19, to insert:

Yosemite National Park, Calif.: To reimburse the appropriation for Yosemite National Park, 1921, for cost of rebuilding section of wood-stave pipe and trestle leading to power plant destroyed by rock slide January 18, 1921, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 17, to strike out "\$8,500" and insert "\$12,866.69," so as to read:

#### FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL.

For subsistence, fuel and light, clothing, bedding, forage, medicine, medical and surgical supplies, surgical instruments, electric lights, repairs, furniture, motor-propelled ambulance, and other absolutely necessary expenses, \$12,866.69.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 6, in the items for Post Office Department, to strike out "\$14,500" and insert "\$15,000, of which sum \$500 shall be available for the purchase of law books and books of reference," so as to read:

For miscellaneous items, including the same objects specified under this head in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, of which sum not to exceed \$500 may be expended for telephone service and not to exceed \$90 may be expended for street car fare, \$15,000, of which sum \$500 shall be available for the purchase of law books and books of reference.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 14, to insert:

For the payment of the obligations of the Post Office Department to the United States Railroad Administration for the transportation of the mails during the 26 months of Federal control of railroads from January 1, 1918, to and including February 29, 1920, \$65,575,832.03.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 19, to insert:

For transportation of mail by railroad routes, fiscal year 1920, \$1,900,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 21, to insert:

For transportation of foreign mails, including the same objects specified under this head in the Post Office appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, \$99,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 13, to insert:

For inland transportation by star routes (excepting service in Alaska), including temporary service to newly established offices, \$1,363,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 21, to insert:

Olympic National Forest: For emergency expenditures incident to the disposal of wind-thrown and intermingled or adjoining timber on the Olympic National Forest and for emergency measures necessary to protect from fire the timber on the Olympic National Forest, including

the repair and construction of roads, fire lines, trails, telephone lines, or other means of communication through or along the boundaries of the area or areas of blown-down timber on the north and west sides of said national forest, and for the employment of extra guards and patrolmen as may be found necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment just agreed to, I ask permission to put into the RECORD a telegram I received several days ago containing the first information I have had with reference to what may be really termed a calamity, and also a telegram which I received this morning from the Chamber of Commerce of Aberdeen, in which they say they think this amount will not be anything like the amount that will be required. I think they are correct in that belief, and I feel satisfied that when the facts are all developed Congress will appropriate whatever money may be necessary to take care of the Government property.

As I wrote to them, this appropriation is simply such an appropriation as we thought it was wise to make on the facts that were presented to us. Congress will be in session all the summer, and when the facts are actually secured and the conditions are fully realized we shall be in a position to do whatever may be necessary in order to protect the interests of the Government.

There being no objection, the telegrams referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BELLINGHAM, WASH., February 10, 1921.

Hon. W. L. JONES,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Belated reports of the great storm of January 29 west and south of Port Angeles show a property loss probably greater than San Francisco earthquake. Hundreds of millions of timber down and billions in danger of fire. The most valuable forest reserve in the country is a wreck, and large areas must be logged within three years or the loss will be counted in billions. It is the greatest property loss that ever happened at one stroke. Fortunately, there is little loss of life. Alex Polson says 150,000,000 of his timber out of 500,000,000 is down. Area involved is from Grays Harbor to Clallam Bay west of the Olympics; about 2,500 square miles. To save the wreck, fire must be kept out and intensive logging under strict regulation. Begin immediately Polson's railway from the south with Goodyear Merrill and Ring and Milwaukee from north with Spruce. Railway through center will salvage three-fourths of timber. Fire danger is so great that you should give Col. Greeley, chief forester, every support. Martial law may be necessary in dry season. Shall go over there and report further to Mr. Hadley next week. There is no immediate danger, but the possibilities are tremendous if fire starts near Quinalt or Mora in summer; all life and property in that country will be wiped out. Support Col. Greeley.

J. J. DONOVAN.

ABERDEEN, WASH., February 18, 1921.

W. L. JONES,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Situation in Olympia Peninsula calls for immediate provision for patrolling to guard against forest fires that otherwise are certain to sweep them this summer. Provision of \$100,000, which we understand will be given by Federal Government for purpose, will be entirely inadequate. If small army of men are not provided as patrols we believe at least half of 100,000,000,000 feet of timber standing on Olympia Peninsula will be lost by fires this year, involving loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in Government and privately owned timber.

ABERDEEN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
 By W. L. MORRIS, Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 53, line 19, to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$300,000," so as to read:

#### BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY.

Preventing spread of moths: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the continued spread of the gypsy moth in New England and the discovery of a large colony in the State of New Jersey and smaller colonies in the States of New York and Pennsylvania, and to provide means for the control and prevention of spread of this insect in the States concerned or elsewhere in the United States, in cooperation with the States concerned, including the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, \$300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 12, to increase the appropriation for eradication of pink bollworm from \$75,000 to \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 14, to insert:

For an additional amount required to meet the increased cost of fuel for the central power plant of the Department of Agriculture, \$19,435.52.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 26, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of Lighthouse Service from \$300,000 to \$468,000.

The amendment was agreed to.



The next amendment was, on page 56, line 3, to increase the appropriation for salaries and wages of officers and crews of light vessels and lighthouse tenders from \$50,000 to \$88,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 14, to insert "and Senate Document No. 387," and in line 15, to strike out "\$362.85" and insert "\$436.12," so as to read:

Damage claims: To pay the claims adjusted and determined by the Commissioner of Lighthouses under the terms of section 4 of the act of June 17, 1910 (36 Stat., p. 537), on account of damages occasioned to private property by collisions with vessels of the Lighthouse Service and for which said vessels were responsible, certified to Congress in House Document No. 912 and Senate Document No. 387 of the present session, \$436.12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 6, to insert:

#### SENATE.

To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay from the appropriation for 1921 for compensation of officers, clerks, messengers, and others, to Mark L. Black for services rendered as clerk to Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN, Senator from the State of Alabama, from November 3, 1920, to December 5, 1920, at the rate of \$2,500 per annum and additional compensation at the rate of \$240 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, on page 59, after line 14, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 59, after line 14, it is proposed to insert:

For additional expenses of reporting and transcribing the debates and proceedings of the Senate and to equalize more nearly the amounts paid by the Senate and House of Representatives for reporting their respective proceedings from July 1, 1921, to June 30, 1922, payable in equal monthly installments, \$4,844.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 23, in the item for printing parliamentary precedents, after the words "House and Senate," to insert "one set each to the Senate and the House branches of the legislative drafting service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, after line 22, to insert:

For printing and binding for the Post Office Department, exclusive of the money-order office, \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 8, to insert "and Senate Document No. 388"; after line 10, to insert "Under the Navy Department, \$2,962.50"; after line 11, to insert "Under the Department of Justice, \$537.43"; and, in line 13, to strike out "\$7,029.58" and insert "\$10,529.51," so as to read:

For payment of the final judgments and decrees, including costs of suits, which have been rendered under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," certified to Congress during the present session by the Attorney General in House Document No. 958 and Senate Document No. 388, and which have not been appealed, namely:

Under the War Department, \$7,029.58;

Under the Navy Department, \$2,962.50;

Under the Department of Justice, \$537.43;

In all, \$10,529.51, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest on the respective judgments at the rate of 4 per cent per annum from the date thereof until the time this appropriation is made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 20, to insert, "and Senate Document No. 398"; in line 22, to strike out "\$121,059.60" and insert "\$155,324.99"; in line 24, to strike out "\$78,064.11" and insert "\$93,898.26"; page 67, line 1, to strike out "\$632,990.11" and insert "\$637,304.51"; in line 3, to strike out "\$117,735.31" and insert "\$122,885.31"; after line 5, to insert "Under the Department of Justice, \$6,135.7"; and, in line 7, to change the total from "\$950,419.40" to "\$1,016,118.34," so as to read:

#### JUDGMENTS, COURT OF CLAIMS.

For payment of the judgments rendered by the Court of Claims and reported to Congress during the present session in House Document No. 956 and Senate Document No. 398, namely:

Under the Treasury Department, \$155,324.99;

Under the War Department, \$93,898.26;

Under the Navy Department, \$637,304.51;

Under the Interior Department, \$122,885.31;

Under the Post Office Department, \$570.27;

Under the Department of Justice, \$6,135.7;

In all, \$1,016,118.34.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 86, to insert:

#### AUDITED CLAIMS.

SEC. 3. That for the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1918 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Con-

gress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884, as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 386, reported to Congress at its present session, there is appropriated as follows.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, after line 12, to insert:

#### CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

For labor-saving machines, Treasury Department, 56 cents.  
For freight, transportation, etc., Public Health Service, \$12.66.  
For freight, transportation, etc., Public Health Service, 1919, \$80.64.  
For pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, Public Health Service, \$6.66.  
For Quarantine Service, 89 cents.  
For salaries and expenses of collectors of internal revenue, \$1,194.54.  
For collecting the war revenue, \$103.39.  
For miscellaneous expenses, Internal Revenue Service, \$3,191.22.  
For refunding internal-revenue collections, \$40.  
For redemption of stamps, \$3,338.70.  
For payment of judgments against internal-revenue officers, \$80,728.90.  
For allowance of drawback, \$1,529.60.  
For Coast Guard, \$678.40.  
For repairs and preservation of public buildings, \$4.67.  
For mechanical equipment for public buildings, \$1.79.  
For operating supplies for public buildings, \$20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, after line 12, to insert:

#### CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

For contingent expenses, War Department, \$41.52.  
For national security and defense, War Department, \$97.05.  
For registration and selection for military service, \$2,808.02.  
For pay, etc., of the Army, \$18,736.77.  
For extra-duty pay to enlisted men as clerks, etc., at Army division and department headquarters, \$154.50.  
For arrears of pay, bounty, etc., \$235.93.  
For incidental expenses, Quartermaster Corps, \$56.  
For supplies, services, and transportation, Quartermaster Corps, \$28,322.24.  
For horses for Cavalry, Artillery, Engineers, etc., \$299.94.  
For shooting galleries and ranges, \$397.75.  
For Medical and Hospital Department, \$33.48.  
For engineer operations in the field, \$98,118.32.  
For Ordnance Service, \$19.68.  
For civilian military training camps, \$29.05.  
For arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, \$240.27.  
For headstones for graves of soldiers, \$64.27.  
For increase of compensation, Military Establishment, \$236.91.  
For sodium nitrate storage, \$7,961.86.  
For quarters for hospital stewards, \$1,634.36.  
For commercial telephone service at Coast Artillery posts, 1920, \$648.33.  
For disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, and civil employees, \$45.08.  
For National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, Pacific Branch, \$214.74.  
For National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, clothing, \$119.44.  
For payment of claims for loss of firearms, etc., taken by United States troops during labor strikes in 1914 in Colorado, \$4.95.  
For transportation of the Army and its supplies, \$6.73.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, after line 4, to insert:

#### CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

For contingent expenses, Navy Department, \$2,863.66.  
For increase of compensation, Naval Establishment, \$15.57.  
For pay, miscellaneous, \$69.11.  
For contingent, Navy, \$24.  
For pay, Marine Corps, \$1,846.02.  
For maintenance, quartermaster's department, Marine Corps, \$180.25.  
For contingent, Marine Corps, \$56.70.  
For transportation, Bureau of Navigation, \$21.86.  
For gunnery and engineering exercises, Bureau of Navigation, \$10.  
For outfits on first enlistment, Bureau of Navigation, \$79.24.  
For organizing the Naval Reserve Force, \$248.  
For ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, \$110.  
For maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, \$1.15.  
For pay of the Navy, \$13,536.35.  
For provisions, Navy, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, \$178.  
For maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, \$6.50.  
For freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1920, \$623,283.23.  
For freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1919, \$173,586.  
For freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, \$3,476.80.  
For fuel and transportation, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1919, \$18,022.27.  
For engineering, Bureau of Steam Engineering, \$8.25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, after line 13, to insert:

#### CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

For maps of the United States, 1919, \$4.79.  
For international protection of industrial property, Patent Office, \$5.05.  
For international protection of industrial property, Patent Office, 1919, \$26.54.  
For investigation of city school administration and education, Bureau of Education, 1919, \$1.  
For Capitol power plant, 1920, \$2,000.  
For Crater Lake National Park, 1919, \$527.28.  
For Glacier National Park, 1919, \$1,707.08.  
For Glacier National Park, 1920, \$3,626.66.  
For Grand Canyon National Park, 1920, \$63.78.  
For Mount Rainier National Park, 1919, \$516.39.  
For Sequoia National Park, 1919, \$666.  
For protecting public lands, timber, etc., 24 cents.  
For expenses of hearings in land entries, \$104.76.  
For surveying the public lands, 1920, \$1,090.20.  
For Geological Survey, \$202.92.  
For general expenses, Bureau of Mines, \$1.19.

For enforcement of the act to regulate explosives, Bureau of Mines, 1919, \$144.46.  
 For Indian schools, support, \$11.03.  
 For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, \$1,334.78.  
 For determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 78 cents.  
 For support of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, 38 cents.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, after line 19, to insert:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR STATE AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

For public printing and binding, \$10,630.38.  
 For national security and defense, executive, \$12.62.  
 For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Efficiency, \$1.45.  
 For transportation of diplomatic and consular officers, 1919, \$427.48.  
 For contingent expenses, foreign missions, \$407.82.  
 For contingent expenses, foreign missions, 1920, \$432.97.  
 For salaries, Consular Service, \$196.54.  
 For salaries, Consular Service, 1919, \$745.  
 For post allowances to diplomatic and consular officers, \$1,000.  
 For contingent expenses, United States consulates, \$77.64.  
 For contingent expenses, United States consulates, 1919, \$95.14.  
 For expenses of consular inspectors, \$203.02.  
 For relief and protection of American seamen, 1919, \$27.74.  
 For relief and protection of American seamen, 1920, \$7,038.08.  
 For salaries, office of Superintendent of State, War, and Navy Department buildings, \$174.79.  
 For Interstate Commerce Commission, \$99.05.  
 For salaries and expenses, Federal Board for Vocational Education, 77 cents.  
 For salaries and expenses, United States Food Administration, \$188.71.  
 For national security and defense, Food and Fuel Administrations, building, \$11.59.  
 For national security and defense, Food and Fuel Administrations, educational, \$303.05.  
 For library, Department of Agriculture, \$92.89.  
 For miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture, \$2,244.91.  
 For general expenses, Weather Bureau, \$4.60.  
 For general expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, \$124.92.  
 For meat inspection, Bureau of Animal Industry, \$1.67.  
 For general expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, \$225.99.  
 For stimulating agriculture and facilitating distribution of products, \$180.62.  
 For general expenses, Forest Service, \$168.46.  
 For general expenses, Bureau of Chemistry, \$10.87.  
 For enforcement of the food and drugs act, \$14.80.  
 For general expenses, Office of Markets and Rural Organization, 75 cents.  
 For general expenses, Bureau of Markets, \$54.39.  
 For enforcement of the United States grain standards act, \$3.28.  
 For general expenses, Federal Horticultural Board, \$27.77.  
 For suppressing spread of pink boll worm of cotton, 8 cents.  
 For contingent expenses, Department of Commerce, \$1.62.  
 For national security and defense, Department of Commerce, \$69.65.  
 For contingent expenses, Steamboat-Inspection Service, 40 cents.  
 For general expenses, Bureau of Standards, 21 cents.  
 For investigation of public utility standards, Bureau of Standards, \$12.22.  
 For military research, Bureau of Standards, \$75.55.  
 For testing railroad scales, etc., Bureau of Standards, \$15.60.  
 For party expenses, Coast and Geodetic Survey, \$64.22.  
 For general expenses, Lighthouse Service, \$10,040.22.  
 For miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Fisheries, \$1.33.  
 For salaries and expenses, Commissioners of Conciliation, \$92.61.  
 For contingent expenses, Department of Labor, 38 cents.  
 For national security and defense, Department of Labor, \$25.99.  
 For expenses of regulating immigration, \$34.51.  
 For enforcement of the child labor law, \$1.26.  
 For investigation of child welfare, Children's Bureau, 63 cents.  
 For detection and prosecution of crimes, \$268.98.  
 For national security and defense, Department of Justice, \$72.20.  
 For books for judicial officers, \$7.50.  
 For salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals, United States courts, \$2.95.  
 For fees of commissioners, United States courts, \$322.35.  
 For fees of commissioners, United States courts, 1919, \$1,741.55.  
 For fees of commissioners, United States courts, 1920, \$8,242.23.  
 For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, \$26.50.  
 For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, 1920, \$1,950.10.  
 For supplies for United States courts, \$1.39.  
 For support of prisoners, United States courts, 1919, \$1,716.30.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, after line 19, to insert:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

For railroad transportation, \$1,107,136.56.  
 For balances due foreign countries, \$339,274.34.  
 For compensation to postmasters, \$2,613.39.  
 For indemnities, International mails, \$683.50.  
 For Star Route Service, \$2,767.33.  
 For City Delivery Service, \$4,201.13.  
 For special-delivery fees, \$1.52.  
 For Rural Delivery Service, \$623.77.  
 For rent, light, and fuel, \$178.70.  
 For city delivery carriers, substitute, auxiliary, and temporary, \$19.95.  
 For freight on stamped paper and mail bags, \$27.14.  
 For shipment of supplies, \$58.23.  
 For city delivery carriers, \$302.36.  
 For payment of rewards, \$325.  
 For separating mails, third and fourth class post offices, \$24.56.  
 For temporary and auxiliary clerks, \$18.  
 For Railway Mail Service, salaries, \$2.42.  
 For clerks, first and second class post offices, \$1,097.85.  
 For watchmen, messengers, and laborers, \$1.94.  
 For temporary clerk hire, \$1,211.32.  
 For city delivery, horse hire, \$1,289.76.  
 For mail messenger service, \$363.55.  
 For Railway Mail Service, miscellaneous expenses, \$20.64.  
 Total audited claims, section 3, \$2,613,385.33.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 97, line 1, to change the section number from "3" to "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. McCUMBER. That completes the committee amendments, does it not?

Mr. WARREN. All the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. McCUMBER. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 59, after the two amendments relating to the Senate, insert:

To pay to Robert W. Farrar, for extra and expert services rendered to the Committee on Pensions during the sessions of the Sixty-sixth Congress, \$1,200.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to explain this amendment very briefly. There are two pension committees in the House, one known as the Committee on Invalid Pensions, which has to do with the veterans of the Civil War; the other, known as the Committee on Pensions, which takes charge of all other pension matters.

Since 1887 there have been detailed from the Pension Office, under the law then passed, two experts to the Committee on Invalid Pensions and one expert to the Committee on Pensions, making three experts from the Pension Office, to assist in the preparation and in the investigation of the many private pension bills.

All of that work is done by one committee in the Senate, the Committee on Pensions, and under the same law there has been detailed from the Pension Office one expert for that committee. The expert, ever since I have been in the Senate, has been Mr. Dennis Kerr, and during the last year he has been sick most of the time. He died last Monday and was buried yesterday.

The work that had formerly been done by Mr. Kerr had to be performed by my secretary, Mr. Farrar. In other words, I had to take my regular secretary and put him exclusively on that work, and he performed the same work that was performed by three experts in the House. Each year those experts in the House have been given \$1,200 extra, and Mr. Kerr also, had he lived until to-day, would have had the \$1,200 extra appropriated for him in this bill. But he died last Thursday. His sickness, however, lasted nearly a year, and practically all of his work during that time was performed by Mr. Farrar.

The House pays the experts detailed to the House committees out of its contingent fund. The Senate has always paid for that work out of the general fund. The purpose of this amendment is to allow to the person who had to leave his general work on the committee and attended exclusively to the work that was performed by Mr. Kerr the same amount Mr. Kerr would have received had he lived until to-day and just one-third of the amount paid in the House for doing the same work.

It seems to me so just that there should be no objection to it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as I was the one who questioned the amendment in the committee, I want to explain why I did so.

It is true there are three men designated from the Pension Office to the House for the purpose of assisting the two pension committees in the House in the preparation of pension bills. But the pension committees there do not have any extra help. They have no more help than the other committees. The Committee on Pensions of the Senate has six clerks, the other committees have but four. It is true Mr. Kerr was for a long time quite ill, and it is true that he died.

I thought, Mr. President, that after the bill passed granting widows of ex-soldiers \$30 a month and each ex-soldier \$50 a month, which would mean, of course, that there would be a small number of bills introduced and acted upon by each Congress in comparison with what there were before, the committee, having two extra clerks, could get along.

I shall not make the point of order against this amendment. I felt when the matter was before the committee as I feel now.

But there was an objection made in the committee, and I was the one who made it, for the reasons I have stated.

It is true that Mr. Kerr, up to the time of the passage of the last bill, received \$1,200 on several occasions. Last year he did not receive the \$1,200, and the only reason why I entered the objection was as I have stated.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me say in reply that the number of clerks on the committee has not been increased since the time when Senator Gallinger was chairman of that committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly aware of that.

Mr. McCUMBER. That was a great many years ago; but the number of pension bills that have passed through that



committee has enormously increased since that time. If I may take up just last year, they have had to go through and examine 3,600 House bills, with all the reports, and 2,100 Senate bills, which had to be thoroughly examined and gone through, and no two clerks could attend to that without the expert help.

As I said, this amendment would only give to Mr. Farrar, who did this work for Mr. Kerr, who was sick, the same amount Mr. Kerr would have received. The country will lose nothing whatever by the change of the fund from the one who would have done the work had he been well to the one who actually did it.

Mr. SMOOT. I recognize the force of that statement; unless we give Mr. Kerr's estate the \$1,200 by special act, and as far as I am personally concerned I would like to see that done. I do not think there was ever a more honest, conscientious, and hard-working employee in the service of the Government of the United States than Mr. Kerr. I do not believe there was ever a man who was so deeply interested in his work. He knew his work as very few men in the Government service know theirs. I would like to see Mr. Kerr's estate, or his dependents, given \$1,200, and I would not care if it was a full year's salary. That man was a splendid worker.

I know that if Mr. Kerr had served me as he served the Government of the United States and had died I would see that his services were recognized, as far as I could do it. I would see that his loved ones were taken care of, at least to a limited degree. I think the very least we could do would be to give his estate a year's salary.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me say to the Senator that I can join in everything he has said in eulogy of Mr. Kerr and his work; but remember, he drew his regular salary, even though he was unable to do the work for most of the last year, and this is simply to pay one who did his work for him.

Mr. SMOOT. I told the Senator from North Dakota I would not make a point of order against this amendment. I know Mr. Farrar, too, but not as well as does the Senator from North Dakota, however; and I know what he has done in the past. But I really thought that the Committee on Pensions, with six employees, could have done the work, when the balance of the committees have only four.

Mr. McCUMBER. They did the work, but they had to do it on Sundays and at nights and at all other times. They did the work, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. Some of the other clerks do extra work, also. Nearly every night I have my clerk up to 12 o'clock dictating letters to him. That is the only time I can do that. If this amendment is to go in the bill, I would like now to move that a year's salary be given to those who were dependent upon Mr. Kerr. I shall prepare the amendment just as soon as I learn their names.

Mr. WARREN. I ask my colleague on the committee if he will not take care of that in another way. He is a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall be glad to do it that way. I shall draw a resolution in accordance with the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. WARREN. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has a great many embarrassments, and he is "held up" sometimes, nearly, as one might say, like the bandits hold up their victims. The most embarrassing feature of all is the apparent ungraciousness of having to make opposition to the wish of a Senator, and especially if the Senator is as near to the chairman in affection as any other Senator could possibly be. But sometimes I think that there ought to be a little more consideration for that chairman, and there ought to be another way to handle these things that become so embarrassing to the committee.

I have nothing to say against the man who seeks this extra pay, and I shall make no point of order; but it seems to me that we ought to find a way to provide for these things as the House does, in a lump sum and out of the contingent fund, rather than to enter upon the program, in the last minutes of Congress, of this Senator and that and the other asking extra pay for this clerk, that, and the other. I say that with no reflection upon the Senator who offers the amendment and no reflection upon the man for whom he offers it, yet it occurs very often, notwithstanding that we have gone from one and two clerks each to four clerks for every Senator, whether he has a committee or not, notwithstanding that some Senators—I do not wish to name them, but I might do so if I had to do so—seem to think that their four clerks are to take care of their correspondence and be ornamental, and if there is any real work which requires the "digging" application, and routine work that the clerks of the Appropriations Committee and

some others have to do, nights and Sundays and every other day, that their clerks must be paid extra.

I may say that when this matter first came up in the committee, without going any further and stating who they were, there were two other Senators who stated immediately that they desired to have extra pay for clerks, one of them not for his own clerk, but for the clerk of another committee, and the other Senator for some other clerk, perhaps his own. If we get started in that line of action, of course, there is no end to it, except within the consideration of the individual Senators.

So I express the wish that the matter might be taken up in another way. I wish hereafter that Senators may, for a moment, at least, put themselves in the place of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and see if they can not help by putting these matters up to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and let that committee provide for them. There is a way that it can be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER].

The amendment was agreed to.

#### COLD-STORAGE FOODS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. GRONNA] a question or two with reference to the adoption of the conference report on the cold storage bill on yesterday. When that matter came up at the opening of the session I was in the Appropriations Committee. I did not know it was coming up at that time.

I received a telegram a few days ago from the dairy interests of my State claiming that the bill, as finally reported by the committee of conference, would work very great injury to that industry, and I intended to ask the chairman of the committee about it. I know that he is as much interested in the farming industry of the country as anyone and that he would be the last man in the country to indorse and put through legislation that would injure any agricultural interest. I have just had sent to me to-day a copy of a telegram, from Congressman KAHN, of California, by a gentleman who claims to represent the poultry interests of California, Oregon, and Washington.

I do not wish to take up very much time of the Senate now, but I do desire to have a brief statement from the chairman of the committee with reference to that feature of the cold storage bill. I think what these people had in mind was that the new provision with reference to the temperature that was required, and so on, would injuriously affect the disposal of their products.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have received a great number of telegrams from people in my own State and from people in other States with reference to the same matter. The bill as it passed the House did not provide for any period for precooling at all. The Senate bill in its original form provided for a period of 30 days for precooling. It was a very difficult matter for the conferees to agree on the item because the Members of the House were opposed to that provision. We finally agreed upon 10 days.

I will say to the Senator from Washington and to the Senate that this does not affect the articles of food to which he has referred. If a carload of eggs or a carload of poultry is shipped from the Pacific coast, the articles or the containers will have to be marked anyway, and the only difference would be the marking of the date, the supplying of the additional figures of the date. The bill as reported to the Senate provided for a period of 10 days for precooling and then provides for 30 days during which the product may be held in cold storage, which means 40 days altogether, without the product being classified as a cold-storage product.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is the precooling proposition that seems to worry these gentlemen. The Senator will appreciate the fact that it will probably take much more than 10 days to ship from the Pacific coast to the eastern market.

Mr. GRONNA. Oh, yes; but I will say to the Senator that the refrigerator cars and the ships are all included and classified as cold-storage warehouses. I will try to give the Senator an illustration. Suppose a carload of eggs is being shipped from his State to New York. Every container in that car would have to have some sort of mark upon it, and the only additional mark that would have to be on those cases of eggs would be the date.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The date of what?

Mr. GRONNA. The date of shipment, or it may be supplied on the invoice according to the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. It may be done in either way. If the eggs are sold within 30 days, they are still classified as fresh eggs. They will not be classified as cold-storage eggs. So the people are laboring under a misapprehension.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is, if they are sold within 30 days from the date of shipment?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; or 40 days from the time that they were first put in cold storage for precooling.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I hope we will not get too many eggs in my basket until we can dispose of the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Have I made the matter clear to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know about it myself, and I am just making inquiries because of certain telegrams that have come to me. I understand that the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has a long letter with reference to the matter and he thinks that probably the act will have to be amended. I feel satisfied that the committee, if they find they have put in a provision that will work injuriously, will ask to have it changed.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to say that all these matters were gone over by the committee, and, if my judgment is worth anything, I will say to the Senator that it will not be necessary to provide an amendment so far as this particular provision is concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say that I am quite sure the bill will have to be amended.

#### DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, immediately following the amendment just agreed to, offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], I submit the following amendment, and I wish to offer a word of explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Under the head of "Senate" the Senator from Iowa moves to amend by inserting the following:

Charles A. Webb, for extra services rendered as clerk of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, \$200.

Mr. KENYON. I know there is force in what the Senator from Wyoming has said.

Mr. WARREN. I am not going to object to the amendment.

Mr. KENYON. It went out in the committee. The Senator must not get angry about it.

Mr. WARREN. I am not angry. I told the Senator I would not object to it. I am satisfied, if it does not lead to more.

Mr. KENYON. In view of that statement I am going to explain the amendment. I am just as much opposed as is the Senator to piling up any extra compensation for clerks. But there are cases that are different from others.

Mr. Webb is the clerk of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. We proceeded with the investigation of campaign expenditures under resolution of the Senate, which was not a particularly desirable job, and there has been a tremendous amount of work. Mr. Webb has worked Sundays and nights. The chairman of the subcommittee supposed that we could pay Mr. Webb extra compensation out of the contingent fund, and I told him, when I asked him to work nights and Sundays and extra time, that he would be so paid. We could have employed some one else to do this enormous amount of work and handle the 11 or 12 volumes of testimony, getting them ready for our report, and it would have cost, I think, four or five hundred dollars. But by having Mr. Webb do it we have saved money to the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. Why does not the Senator make it \$1,200, the same as the other amendment?

Mr. KENYON. No; that is too much.

Mr. SMOOT. He did just as much work as the other man, and more.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; Mr. Webb did just as much work as the other man. When that amendment went out in the committee I did not insist on the Webb amendment staying in. But Mr. Webb is a modest man and has not any exaggerated idea of the value of his services. This is not enough to pay him for all his extra work, but it is something, and I feel that in offering it I am doing the right thing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] I propose the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 39, after line 13, insert the following paragraph:

For the conduct of investigations in the development and standardization of methods of preservation of Pacific coast fishes, including the payment of salaries and traveling expenses and the purchase of materials and supplies, \$10,000.

Mr. WARREN. I intended that this item should be included in the sundry civil appropriation bill, but it was overlooked. I had no objection to it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, in the earlier consideration of the bill I inquired of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], if he had an estimate from the Treasury Department for \$200,000 for the improvement of the quarantine station at New York. I explained at the time that the State of New York had turned this quarantine station over to the Government yesterday and that I had understood the Treasury Department had made an estimate for the improvement. Since that time the chairman of the committee has received an estimate. I merely wish to state that I have a letter here in connection with the matter from the Secretary of the Treasury, who strongly urges that the appropriation be made, in view of the threatened epidemic of typhus as a result of the large immigration to this country during the past few weeks. I propose to submit an amendment to cover the matter, and I shall ask the Senator from Wyoming not to object, but to let it go to conference.

Mr. WARREN. I suggest that the Senator send the amendment to the desk and let it be read.

Mr. CALDER. Very well. If it afterwards develops that it is necessary for him to do so, the provision may be eliminated from the bill. I think, however, it is a most important amendment and that it should be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 19, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

New York, N. Y., quarantine station: For water supply, additional buildings, increased disinfecting facilities, and miscellaneous equipment, including all necessary mechanical equipment, lighting fixtures, etc., \$200,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate that I expect, if we can finish the bill to-night, we may save from five to ten million dollars, or perhaps \$20,000,000 for every day hereafter, because estimates are coming in so fast, and wet with fresh ink when they come here, that it is impossible to keep up with them, although there seems to be a beaten path from the Public Health Service by way of the Treasury to the Senate. I am not going, however, to object to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair inquire how that estimate got to the committee?

Mr. WARREN. It was brought to my desk by the Senator from New York a few moments ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the heads of the departments communicate to the United States Senate through the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. There is no doubt about that, and that should be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is saying this for the benefit of his successor. Recently communications from the departments seem to be sent almost anywhere.

Mr. WARREN. The Vice President is perfectly right about that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They are supposed to come to the President of the Senate and by him to be placed in the Record.

Mr. WARREN. That is why I said that it is dangerous to keep this bill before the Senate any longer; it has already been greatly increased. At least 20 different matters have been brought up here since the committee concluded the consideration of the bill on yesterday.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the estimate was transmitted in the regular way to the Speaker of the House. It should undoubtedly have come to the Vice President, but it was a matter of emergency. The messenger from the Treasury Department handed it to me, and I handed it to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to say that it is simply a copy of a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not objecting; he is simply entering a protest against such a method of transmitting communications to the Senate of the United States. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.



The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### BRITISH POSSESSIONS IN WEST INDIES.

Mr. REED. I introduce a resolution which I should like to have read—it is short—and lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 457) was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the President be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to ascertain whether the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain, etc., is willing to discuss the cession by it to the United States of all or any part of its possessions in the West Indies, including the island of Trinidad, and also the Bermuda Islands.*

Mr. REED. I should like to embrace this opportunity to say merely that in the near future I intend to address the Senate on this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 15812, being the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, we are very anxious to proceed to-morrow with the immigration bill. I think that we can dispose of it in the early part of the day, possibly; at any rate, that is the expectation of those with whom I have discussed the matter. Much as I should like to accommodate my friend from North Dakota, I dislike to have the Agricultural appropriation bill taken up at this time, as thereby the unfinished business would be displaced.

Mr. GRONNA. Is the immigration bill the unfinished business now?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes; the immigration bill is the unfinished business.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to Senators on the other side of the Chamber that we have resumed and completed the consideration of and passed one appropriation bill and considered and passed two other appropriation bills to-day. The hour is growing late. I know there are a number of Senators on our side who are interested in the immigration bill, and also others who are very much interested in the Agricultural appropriation bill. I should not like to have the motion to take up that bill come to a vote at this late hour. I think we should take a recess now and leave the status remain as it is, and to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock determine the question when everybody is here.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I withhold it.

#### RAILROAD EXPENSES UNDER GOVERNMENT GUARANTY.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read, and then I shall ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The reading clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 459), as follows:

Whereas the transportation act of 1920 provides for a definite guaranty of net earnings out of the Treasury of the United States during the period from March 1 to September 1, 1920, and for the fixing of freight rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission to yield net earnings amounting to a definite per cent upon the so-called "aggregate value" of the railroads; and

Whereas any artificial, fictitious, or fraudulent increases in operating expenses or other reduction of bona fide net earnings constitute an unwarranted and vicious drain either upon the Treasury of the United States or upon the pockets of American producers, shippers, and consumers; and

Whereas some or all of the railroads subject to the transportation act have contracted to pay unreasonable and extravagant prices for railway supplies, equipment, repairs, and renewals charged to maintenance account; and

Whereas separate corporations have been organized in certain cases, with the participation of railroad officials and stockholders, to which railroad shops have been leased for nominal sums and to the profit of their promoters; and

Whereas it is stated upon good authority that the charges paid by railway companies for supplies, equipment, repairs, and renewals are excessive, amounting to from two to five times the cost of doing the work in the shops of the railroads; and

Whereas it is further charged that these excessive prices for repair work have fictitiously and fraudulently increased the operating expenses of the roads and thereby imposed an unwarranted drain upon the Treasury of the United States and the American people amounting to many millions of dollars per annum; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has conducted investigations into the relative costs of repairs and construction work in the railroad shops and in the shops of equipment companies and are collecting and have acquired a large amount of reliable data upon the subject since the railroads were returned to private control: Therefore be it

*Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to furnish to the Senate of the United States all information in its possession relating to this subject.*

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I prefer to have an opportunity to look over that resolution. Therefore I shall object to its present consideration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then I ask that it lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule the resolution goes over and lies on the table.

#### EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF RAILROAD OPERATION.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin will be read.

The reading clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 458), as follows:

Whereas certain bills now before Congress propose to confer certain benefits and privileges upon the railroads of the country; and

Whereas these benefits and privileges will empower the railroads to secure from the United States Government certain monetary advantages which they would not otherwise secure; and

Whereas the railroads have contended and are now contending that such monetary advantages and other privileges are due them as a result of Government operation or should be granted them in order to free them from unnecessary regulations which they contend would curtail efficiency and economy; and

Whereas these monetary advantages will mean increased expenditure by the people and Government of the United States and will be an unwarranted burden unless they do institute just remuneration and do make possible increased economy and efficiency; and

Whereas it is essential that the Senate have at its disposal all available information as to the justness of the claims and the efficiency and economy of railroad operation which is a material fact in the claims advanced by the railroads; and

Whereas in the report of the director of the division of operation of the United States Railroad Administration for the year 1919 it is stated:

"From the beginning the mechanical department has diligently endeavored to maintain the equipment without any idea that economies should or could be realized by reducing maintenance which the equipment ought to receive. With this thought in mind, we began immediately after the roads were placed under Federal control to check locomotive shop output and roundhouse and shop costs, so that all unnecessary expenditures might be eliminated and greater efficiency in shop and roundhouse operation obtained. Where improper practices were found to exist, action was taken through the regional directors to have more efficient methods adopted.

"In order that expenditures for maintenance of equipment might be measurably controlled, Federal managers were required to prepare and submit on suitable forms information regarding maintenance of equipment during the test period, during the seven years prior to the test period, as well as during the calendar year 1918. This information was collected on the basis of the miles of roads operated, the units of equipment, and the locomotive and car miles, together with averages showing the cost of locomotive repairs separately on the basis of miles run, tractive power miles, and per locomotive owned.

"Freight-car repairs were reported on the basis of 10,000 freight-car miles and freight cars owned, and the passenger-train car repairs were reported on the same basis.

"From these reports studies of the maintenance of equipment costs were made and furnished to the regional directors, to keep them in touch with the actual conditions and aid them in the control of maintenance of equipment expenses.

"In this work we have constantly kept before us the thought that the ability of the railroads to move present and prospective business was the first consideration, and after this requirement had been fully met reductions in maintenance expenditures which could properly be made should be made on railroads which were clearly overexpended in the matter of maintenance of equipment in comparison with the test period, but in no case has the fact that a railroad has been overexpended for maintenance of equipment been permitted to reduce maintenance to a point where it would interfere with the handling of traffic.

"Analyzing and tabulating the information received from the different railroads in connection with the maintenance of equipment expenditures is going forward, so that all available data may be in shape for proper consideration when needed. This also includes the establishment of equation factors for increased costs of labor and material to enable comparisons to be made as between the test period and the period of Federal control"; and

Whereas in this report it is further stated: "The work of the field forces has consisted of making special investigations of improper conditions reported, checking up conditions in shops, engine houses and repair yards for the purpose of promoting efficiency and economy in operation and handling labor matters that had not reached the stage where they should be referred to the Division of Labor.

"During the war the forces at practically all terminals had been built up to such an extent that they were out of proportion to the business handled. A check on the Erie Railroad, in 1918, showed the need for a thorough investigation of shop and engine-house conditions on all railroads; therefore this work was extended and developed into a comprehensive system of reporting conditions of shop and engine-house operation monthly through the regional directors.

"On account of the changed values due to increased labor and material costs a comparison on a money basis was worthless; there-

fore, all comparisons of shop and engine-house operation were made on a man-hour basis.

To illustrate the improvement in conditions, a check of 2,921 engine houses in January, 1919, showed an average of 30.68 man-hours per locomotive handled, while a check of the same engine houses in July, 1919, showed 25.77 man-hours per locomotive handled, or a decrease of 7,013,038 in the number of man-hours in handling approximately 54,000 locomotives. This represents a saving per month of \$4,263,541, which is at the rate of approximately \$50,000,000 per annum.

Other matters which have been investigated by the field forces include disputes between officials and the employees, losses due to good material finding its way into the scrap bins, shop practices, and the efficient use of machine tools, storage of material to see that it is properly protected, condition of shops and shop grounds, condition of roundhouses, turntables, cinder pits, and other terminal facilities to see that they were sufficient and were efficiently operated, checking up car-repair forces and facilities, and in many instances reorganizing forces at division points or on an entire railroad, seeing that shops and repair yards were properly supplied with material and tools so that the work could proceed without delay." Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Director General of Railroads be requested to furnish the Senate with said information compiled by the special field forces of the mechanical department relative to improper conditions in shops, engine houses, and repair yards, and to the comparative efficiency of shop and engine-house operation as reported monthly to the administration.

Also, all studies of maintenance of equipment made on the basis of the check of locomotive shop output and roundhouse and shop costs with a view to eliminating unnecessary expense and to increasing efficiency.

Also, all the information prepared and submitted to Federal managers regarding maintenance of equipment during the test period, during the seven years prior to the test period, and during the calendar year of 1918.

And, in general, all information gathered and tabulated by the administration, as indicated in the foregoing quotations, from the report of the director of division of operation relative to maintenance of equipment, as well as the equation factors for increased costs of labor and material, to enable comparisons to be made as between the test period and the period of Federal control.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made. The resolution will lie over under the rule.

RECESS.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, February 19, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18 (legislative day, February 14), 1921.*

#### APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

##### QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

*To be second lieutenant with rank from July 1, 1920.*

Corwin Lynn Rogers, late second lieutenant, Infantry, United States Army.

##### FIELD ARTILLERY.

Maj. Daniel Whilldin Hand, Field Artillery, to be lieutenant colonel, May 21, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

##### INFANTRY.

Lieut. Col. Orval P. Townshend, to be lieutenant colonel, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, with rank from June 3, 1916.

William Montrose Inglis, late colonel, Infantry, to be major with rank from July 1, 1920, United States Army.

Maj. John Halpin Burns, Infantry, to be captain with rank from July 1, 1920, United States Army.

*To be first lieutenants.*

First Lieut. Luis Felipe Cianchini, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, with rank from November 1, 1918.

First Lieut. Victor Emanuel Domenech, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, with rank from December 21, 1919.

*To be second lieutenants.*

Second Lieut. Timothy Sapia Bosch, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, with rank from October 26, 1917.

Second Lieut. Juan Luis Oliver, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, with rank from October 26, 1917.

Second Lieut. Eduardo Andina, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, with rank from October 26, 1917.

#### REAPPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

##### SIGNAL CORPS.

Maj. Consuelo Andrew Seoane to be lieutenant colonel with rank from July 1, 1920, Signal Corps, United States Army.

##### FIELD ARTILLERY.

Robert Benjamin Hood, late first lieutenant (temporary captain), to be first lieutenant with rank from February 10, 1921, Field Artillery, Regular Army.

#### COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Jacob Arthur Mack, late major, to be major with rank from January 24, 1921, Field Artillery, Regular Army.

#### INFANTRY.

Herbert Benjamin Wilcox, late second lieutenant (temporary first lieutenant), to be first lieutenant with rank from January 24, 1921, Infantry, Regular Army.

Prince Edgerton Tripp, late first lieutenant, to be first lieutenant with rank from July 1, 1920, Infantry, United States Army.

#### QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Q. M. Sergt. Charles August Bader to be captain with rank from July 1, 1920, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, retired.

Earl Raymond Adlington, late first lieutenant, to be first lieutenant with rank from July 1, 1920, Motor Transport Corps, United States Army.

#### MEDICAL CORPS.

Fletcher Olin McFarland, late major (temporary lieutenant colonel), to be captain with rank from January 27, 1921, Medical Corps.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

*To be colonels.*

Lieut. Col. Alfred Aloe, Infantry, from February 1, 1921.

Lieut. Col. Frank Wheaton Rowell, Infantry, from February 1, 1921.

Lieut. Col. James Bradner Allison, Signal Corps, from February 1, 1921.

*To be lieutenant colonels.*

Maj. George Francis Connolly, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Sylvester Bonnaffon, III, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920, since retired from active service.

Capt. Rowland Beverly Ellis, Cavalry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Albert Stanley Fuger, Field Artillery, with rank from August 17, 1920.

Maj. Stanley Symmes Ross, Finance Department, with rank from August 22, 1920.

Maj. Wallace McNamara, Infantry, with rank from September 1, 1920.

Maj. Alden Max Graham, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from September 3, 1920.

Maj. Robert LeRoy Collins, Cavalry, with rank from September 5, 1920.

Maj. Irvin Lee Hunsaker, Cavalry, with rank from September 10, 1920.

Maj. Clifton Ranney Norton, Cavalry, with rank from September 15, 1920.

Maj. Charles Russell Mayo, Cavalry, with rank from September 17, 1920.

Maj. Arthur James Lynch, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from September 21, 1920.

Maj. Guy Eugene Bucker, Infantry, with rank from September 22, 1920.

Maj. Edwin Oliver Saunders, Judge Advocate General's Department, from December 27, 1920.

Maj. Walter Krueger, Infantry, from January 6, 1921.

Maj. Asa Leon Singleton, Infantry, from January 19, 1921.

Maj. Arthur Le Roy Bump, Infantry, from January 26, 1921.

Maj. George Grunert, Cavalry, from January 28, 1921.

Maj. Harry Westervelt Gregg, Air Service, from January 29, 1921.

Maj. William Rivers Pope, Cavalry, from February 1, 1921.

Maj. Staley Alfred Campbell, Infantry, from February 1, 1921.

Maj. John Rowe Brewer, Infantry, from February 1, 1921.

Maj. Olney Place, Cavalry, from February 2, 1921.

*To be majors with rank from July 1, 1920.*

Capt. Ephraim Foster Graham, Cavalry.

Capt. James Saye Dusenbury, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Fredrick Clifford Rogers, Infantry.

Capt. Joseph Dowd Brown, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Lehman Wellington Miller, Corps of Engineers.

Capt. Edson Irwin Small, Infantry.

*To be captains with rank from July 1, 1920:*

Second Lieut. Henry Stehman Hostetter, Finance Department.

Second Lieut. Emmet Crawford Morton, Finance Department.

First Lieut. William Tecumseh Haldeman, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. James Michael Grey, Quartermaster Corps.

First Lieut. Marcus Aurelius Smith Ming, Field Artillery.

First Lieut. Walter Raymond Graham, Infantry.



First Lieut. Albert Hovey Peyton, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Patrick Murphy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Neal Creighton Johnson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Norman Pyle Groff, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Nelson Dingley, 3d, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Claudius Miller Easley, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ernest Frederick Apeldorn, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Richard Weaver Hocker, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John Cleveland Robinson Hall, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Benton Frank Munday, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Ware Whitney, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Peter P. Salgado, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Henry Hockwald, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Frederick LeRoy Black, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles Samuel Moyer, Chemical Warfare Service.  
 First Lieut. Dennis Coburn Pillsbury, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Sidney Lanier Conner, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph James Goffard, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Joseph McShane, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Martin Ackerson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Herbert Edwin Featherstone, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Unsworth McCoskrie, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edgar Gersham Coursen, jr., Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Edward William Budy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Andrew Jackson McFarland, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Myles Douglas Savelle, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Rudolf Karl Schlaepfer, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Jacob Giger, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John William Stanley, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Clyde Pickett, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. John Neely Hopkins, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Agnew Howland, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Clifton Augustine Pritchett, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Luke Donald Zech, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lucian Dalton Bogan, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Richard Law Hubbell, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Ralph Miller, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Nels Erick Stadig, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ben-Hur Chastaine, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leigh Bell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Frederick Spann, Quartermaster Corps.  
 Second Lieut. McGregor Snodgrass, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Herman Knuebel, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Erle Dorr Ferguson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Clayton Luck, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Harry Tompkins, Corps of Engineers.  
 First Lieut. Charles Cameron Lewis, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Ralph Kerschner, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Harry Richardson Simmons, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Kenneth Frederick Hanst, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Harold Root, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Fred W. Miller, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Arthur Alexander McClaughry, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ross Ormali Baldwin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Alphonse Kilian, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Donald Patrick Muse, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Karl Christian Schwinn, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Perry Lee Baldwin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Thomas Shank, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Thomas Butler Burgess, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Russell Conwell Throckmorton, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Albert Chester Searle, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Asa North Duncan, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Francis Coleman, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carl Austin Russell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Hal Tanner Vigor, Quartermaster Corps.  
 Second Lieut. Will Gillette Gooch, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Grover Carlin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Maurice Joseph McGuire, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Carey Rogers, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Edward Ebert Walker, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Chauncey Harold Hayden, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Erle Oden Sandlin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Roy Minor Robinson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Isaac George Walker, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Edward Jenkins, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. William Elmer Lynd, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Everett Franklin Brooks, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ernest Louis McLendon, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Ralls Lawson, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Rhodes Felton Arnold, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ivan Sanders Curtis, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Aln Dudley Warnock, Infantry.

First Lieut. Eugene Nelson Slappey, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harwood Christian Bowman, Field Artillery.  
 Second Lieut. Laurence Henry Hanley, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Rosenham Beam, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Harry McCorry Henderson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Van Kleeck Harris, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Pleas Blair Rogers, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Richard Grant Hunter, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Hubert Vincent Hopkins, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Wade Woodson Rhein, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Benton Gribble Shoemaker, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ben Allen Mason, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Herman Young, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Keith Bolling Wise, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Curtis Mellon, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Donald Wilson, Air Service.  
 Second Lieut. Robert T. Hayes, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Claud Greene Hammond, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Patrick Moore, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Albert Eugene Andrews, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Dorris Aby Hanes, Quartermaster.  
 First Lieut. John Wesley Rodman, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Frank Austin Heywood, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Jacob Bethurum, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. William Henry Halstead, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Randolph Gordon, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Henry Passant Lewis, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Glenn Adelbert Ross, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Philip Coleman Clayton, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ellis Bashore, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Leonard Tupper, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Louis Rada Salvosa, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. John Derby Hood, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Melvin Reginald Ginn, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Dillard Goodrich, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Joshua Dever Powers, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Vincent Gair, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John Vincil Stark, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Augustus Keating, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carlyle Judson Hancock, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Allison Joseph Barnett, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Pollock Bush, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. William Settle Evans, Field Artillery.  
 Second Lieut. Walter Moody Tenney, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Shelby Levinsohn, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Richard Bartholomew Moran, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Oscar Walsh, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Harry Lauman Waggoner, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Walter Herbert Wells, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. LeRoy Lutes, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. William King Harvey, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Richard Thomas Edwards, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Welcome Porter Waltz, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Edwin Hugh Johnson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Williston Callahan, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Russell McKee Herrington, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Lawrence Aloysius Quinn, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Lewis Abram Pulling, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Dallas Royce Alfante, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Peter Hanses, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Fred Matthew Fogle, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Luis Felipe Cianchini, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Carroll Waters, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Ernest Terrill Barco, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Lester Amiel Daugherty, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Porter Prescott Lowry, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Jerome Jackson Waters, jr., Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Grafton Hanson, jr., Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Victor Emanuel Domenech, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Jay Cecil, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. George Albert Moore, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. James Madison Shelton, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Antonio Andres Vazquez, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Alex Shepherd Quintard, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Forsyth Bacon, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ralph Leslie Joyner, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Roscoe Stewart Parker, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Norman Minus, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Heywood Shallus Dodd, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Kent Craig Lambert, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. George Edward Huthstainer, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Gerald O'Malley, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Maurice Morgan, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Gilbert Edwin Bixby, Cavalry.

First Lieut. John Downing Hill, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Wiltshire Gano, Corps of Engineers.  
 First Lieut. John Leonard Pierce, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Joseph Atkinson, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Charles Frederick Houghton, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Lowell Ward Rooks, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Samuel Davies Bedinger, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Malcolm Vaughn Fortier, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ivan Neal Waldron, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Edward Christopher Allworth, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Roland Winfred Wittman, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Walter Nicholson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Allan Young, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Haines Lee, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ray Bradford Conner, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Malcolm McGregor Maner, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Lloyd McKee, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Glenn Luman Allen, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Rouse Jones, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Willard Stewart Paul, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Moritz Augustus Rust Loth, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Henry Chance, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Briggs Day, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Harry Augustine Buckley, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Samuel Rufus Ward, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. March Hugo Houser, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Brown Golden, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Willfred Rowell Higgins, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frederick Stone Matthews, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Jesse Pees Green, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Howard Winthrop Turner, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. William Audley Taber, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Henry Garner Sebastian, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Wesley Crowell Brigham, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. William Major Goldston, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Cyrus Higginson Searcy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leon Edward Norris, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. David McAllister Hunter, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Tasso Wadsworth Swartz, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edward William McCaskey, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frederick Irving Eglin, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Joseph James Pire, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Turner Ransom Sharp, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. William Joshua Jackson, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. George Truman Phipps, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Fred Daring, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Merle Clifford Leonard, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Allan Johnson, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Frank Tillotson, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Jesse Russell Bowles, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Barrett DeTuberville Lambert, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ward Currey Goessling, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Richard David Daugherty, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Ogden Johnson, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Miron James Rockwell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Burton Gibson, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Victor Roland Woodruff, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Gustave Adolph Mellanchton Anderson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William E. Kepner, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Melvin Selmer Williamson, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Chapman Peters, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert William Yates, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles McDonald Parkin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Dana Caswell Schmahl, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Frank Peter Stretton, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Wilbur Granville Dockum, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Clinton Mansfield Lucas, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Jacob Edward Bechtold, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Adamson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Burden Berry, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Steele Wotkins, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Samuel Gilbert Fairchild, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Francis Augustus Woolfley, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Francis Stromeier, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Leslie Leonard Connett, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Owen Rivers Rhoads, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carl Russell Adams, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Joe L. Ostrander, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Byron Tully Ippock, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. George Walter Hovey, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Elmer Forrest Wallender, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carl Eugene Driggers, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carl Grady Lewis, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Vincent Hand, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ray S. Perrin, Field Artillery.

First Lieut. Frederick Vernon Edgerton, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Edward Grant, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. George Alva Stockton, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ben Menadue Sawbridge, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Charles W. Neues, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Wheeler Keltz, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Warren Daniel Davis, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Dominic Joseph Sabini, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Woodworth Bowman Allen, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Ferris, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lewis Mesherry, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles Thomas Halbert, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Herman Feldman, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Ned Blair, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Perry Mortimer, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ernest Alvin Kindervater, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Jared Irwin Wood, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Gordon Cogswell Irwin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Everett Marlon Yon, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Grady Henry Pendergrast, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Earle Frye, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Harvey Fye, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. George Lawrence Hopkins, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Mood McMullin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Krebs Coulter, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Nicholas Szilagyi, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frederick Weston Hyde, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leon Stanley Hatfield, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Royal Lehner, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Rosser Lee Hunter, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carroll Arthur Powell, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. Claude Gilbert Benham, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. James Lester Allbright, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Feodor Otto Schmidt, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Francis Brittingham, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Frank Clide De Langton, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Oscar Bergstrom Abbott, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Seymour McCullough, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carter Roderick McLennan, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Roderick Alexander Stamey, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Ernest Duvendeck, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Geoffrey Galwey, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Louis Garland Gibney, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. David Seth Doggett, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John Frank Gleaves, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Daniel Ruppel, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Allen Flood Kirk, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Grady Jenkins, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Francis Samuel Bayard Cauthorn, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Roy Dayton Burdick, Corps of Engineers.  
 First Lieut. Madison Edward Walker, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Richard Smith Duncan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Ensor Simpson, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Winthrop Ausley Hollyer, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Franklin Abraham Green, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. David Haldane Trevor, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Leslie Carlyle Wheat, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lawrence Harold Bixby, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Robert William Norton, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Compere Lattimore, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Charles James Booth, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Claire Algernon Whitesell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Russell Hubbard Dixon, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Everett Marshall Graves, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. William Tuttle Hamilton, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Valentine McCraight, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Virgil Bell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Granville Purdy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Chesley Ray Miller, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frederick Francis Duggan, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Francis Ray Mann, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Walter Lee Mitchell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Franklin Dark, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Minucan Dabney Cannon, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Howard Baird, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ralph Slate, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Nathan Eugene McCluer, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Ernest John, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Francis Hutchins Waters, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ralph Marshal Caulkins, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Taylor Bauskett, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Claudius Leo Lloyd, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Francis Gaines Bishop, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carlisle Barksdale Cox, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Lester Brooks, Infantry.



First Lieut. Moe Neufeld, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Carlos Watkins Bonham, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Donald Richard McComas, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Sidney James Cutler, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John James Finnessy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Wells Jacobson, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Richard Fairfax Leahy, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Howard Chesebrough Okie, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Eddie James Lee, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Mathew Cline, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Edward Barclay Wharton, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Frederick Philip Schlandt, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Lewis Edward Hunt, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles Henry Ainsworth, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Leasley Eugene Spencer, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 Second Lieut. James Oliver Smithley, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Henry Hardy Slicer, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Edward Sandford Pegram, jr., Corps of Engineers.  
 First Lieut. Stanley Gloninger Saulnier, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Will Hughes Gordon, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Joseph Johnston, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Marion Rhodes, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. John James Maher, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Rice Warren White, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Dudley Blanchard Howard, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Willard Wadsworth Irvine, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Edmund Cecil Fleming, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Charles Emerson Boyle, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. William Doughty Evans, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Clarence Noble Winston, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Elmer Parks Gosnell, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Benjamin Tuttle, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Donald Armpriester Stroh, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Henry Parker, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Adolph Henn, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Ashley Spencer Le Gette, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Russell Thomas George, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Clyde McCormick, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Alfred Mynderse Goldman, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Erskine Ashley Franklin, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Allen Dearing, Chemical Warfare Service.  
 First Lieut. Albert Miller Jackson, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Lyle Bishop Chapman, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. George Raymond Owens, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Andrew Davis Bruce, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Richard Marshall Winfield, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Edward Maher, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Philip Kohn, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Dallas Loyd Knoll, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Philip Armour Helmbold, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Justin Van Buskirk, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Floyd Emerson Galloway, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Edwin Selby, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Creveling Trumbower, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. Herbert Everett Watkins, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Henry Yost Lyon, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Raymond Lovejoy Newton, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Anthony Cistero, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas William Freeman, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Paxton Sterrett Campbell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Ross Irvin, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Alfred Lyons Baylies, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Roy Leo Schuyler, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Torrance McAleer, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Louis De Laussure Hutson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Paul Reuben Wing, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Edward Jedd Roe, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Lathan Hunter Collins, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Loren Prescott Stewart, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frederick Linwood Topping, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Nathaniel L. Simmonds, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ralph Burgess Skinner, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Florence O'Donoghue, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Alan Walter Jones, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles S. Brodbent, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Myron Weldon Tupper, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Stanley Allan Thomson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Emery Williamson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Richard Doran, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Candier Asbury Wilkinson, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Milton A. Lowenberg, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Reid Russell, Infantry.

First Lieut. John Adams Hettinger, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Byron Wilson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carroll Leonard Ellis, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Stanley Young Kennedy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Wilson Belcher, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. George Atalbert Goodyear, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Paul Houston Morris, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. John Richard Williams, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. George Ralston Middleton, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Henry Shea, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Franklyn Thatcher Lord, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Guy Douglas Thompson, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Royden Kenner Fisher, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Marlin Clark Martin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. David Lee Hooper, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Louis Morrison, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Fuller Blodgett, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Raphael Phillips, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Oliver Edward George Trechter, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Stone Reilly, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Richard Allen Gordon, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John Lee Autrey, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Henry Haskins, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Lawrence, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. Alfred Carleton Moeller, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Frederick Lofquist, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Adrin Bruno Smith, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Napoleon Boudreau, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 Second Lieut. William James Briscoe, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Tom Ward, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Herbert Winterburn, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Stephen Joseph Idzorek, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Clarence Le Roy Strike, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Roscoe Holt, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Rolland Edward Stafford, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. Clyde Charles Alexander, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Henry Mackay Shaw, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Robert Grant Mangum, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Ernest Kuehn, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Robert Andrew Blair, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Robert Lee Hostetler, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph De Garino, Quartermaster Corps.  
 Second Lieut. Yates Douglas Fetterman, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Henry Green, Quartermaster Corps.  
 Second Lieut. Robert A. Barth, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Russell Gilbert Barkalow, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Hardy Jacks Story, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Frederick Gent, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carl William Connell, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Lee Gunnels Carson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Chambord Henry St. Germain, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Hardy Pate Browning, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. Thomas K. Petty, Cavalry.  
 Second Lieut. William Earle Reid, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Jesse William Penn, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Jacob Herschel Lawrence, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Tee Bozarth, Philippine Scouts.  
 Second Lieut. Ancil Gatliff Davis, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Martin Luther Kelley, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Samuel Baxter Wiener, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Norris Peters Walsh, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Hans Ottzenn, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Jay Wilson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Grover Cleveland Graham, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Augustine Aloysius Kane, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Edgar Joseph Tulley, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ray Eugene Quigley, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Clarence Frederick King, Philippine Scouts.  
 Second Lieut. Carl Cooley Burgess, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Roy Brockschink, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Axel Hawkenson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Washington Latimer, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Jessee, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Wilbert Vernon Renner, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Howard Rustemeyer, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Elwin Stewart Ferrand, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. Verne Miller, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Settle Voss, Air Service.  
 Second Lieut. Wilbur Herbert Towle, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Fred Fabri, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Francis Crahan, Quartermaster Corps.  
 Second Lieut. Ernest A. Fischer, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Floyd Moore, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harvey Newton Christman, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Winchester Benson, Cavalry.

First Lieut. Charles Cramer, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. George Prentice Cummings, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Winston Burkett, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Clyde Eugene Austin, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Victor Geoffrey Huskea, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Fred Blackburn Rogers, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Sexton Berg, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Cornelius Francis O'Keefe, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Martin McSwain, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Kenahan, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Raymond Dresden Willis, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. James Philip Lyons, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lloyd Leon Harvey, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Ernest Samusson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Alfred Steere Knight, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Thomas Watson Hastey, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Bert Emory Cooper, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Hurley Oran Richardson, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Richard August Burkle, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Alfred Gustave Eritzland, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Louis de Jussewicz, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Chester John Hirschfelder, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Morris Berman, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Richard Fayette Fairchild, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Donald John Myers, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Allen Easterbrook, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Herbert Allyn Myers, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Shelby Cyrus Newman, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Rhey Thoburn Holt, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. George Fridjhof Bloomquist, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lloyd Sylvester Dennis, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Ernest Esser, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Emil Stoner, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edgar Ardeen Elkins, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Roy Francis Lynd, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ernest Clifford Ayer, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Edwin Alger, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. James Lester Ballard, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leon Wilbur Strozler, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Martin Robert Rice, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John Patrick Ferriter, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. Richard Kidder Meade, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. John Daniel Cook, Philippine Scouts.  
 Second Lieut. Thomas Frederick Wirth, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Theodore Bundy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Bender, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Richard Louis Pemberton, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Maurice Allen Hockman, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Edward James Turgeon, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Leavey Cleaver, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. George Corbett Pilkington, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Kirker Campbell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Louis Bachus, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Elmer Theodore Foss, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Valentine Pearsall Foster, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. David Esmond Cleary, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. John Henry Balmat, jr., Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Harold Dean Woolley, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William James Schaal, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John William Signer, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Fay Ross, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Forrest Edwin Collins, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry LeRoy Branson, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Nels Louis Soderholm, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Walter Scott Arthur, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Cyril Branston Spicer, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carl Marcus Ulsaker, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Grover Cleveland Cleaver, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Henry Rogers, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Allen Austin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Alexander Ellis, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Sydney Clyde Ferguson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Josiah Ara Wallace, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Charles Perfect, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Milroy Stork, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Fayette Fargo Collins, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. James Truman Menzie, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Charles William Hagen, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Glenn A. Ross, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Albert Michael Guidera, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Mark Vinton Brunson, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Elbridge Gerry Chapman, jr., Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Homer Bobo Battenberg, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Norman Doud Finley, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Philip Theodore Fry, Infantry.

First Lieut. Calvin Halcomb Burkhead, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. Wilmer Micajah Flinn, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Fred Page Andrews, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. Bernard Smith, Corps of Engineers.  
 First Lieut. Donald Buckingham Greenwood, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Lewis Charles Beebe, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Clinton William Ball, Corps of Engineers.  
 First Lieut. Julius Conrad Tips, jr., Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Everett Ernest Brown, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Bassett Huston, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Raymond Edward Vaughan, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Coburn Lee Berry, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. James A. Sanders, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Orland Smith Peabody, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Benedict Leo Maloney, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Peter Nolan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Theodore Kreh, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Harry Lee Hagan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George David Condren, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Gersun Cronander, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Burgie Smith, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Alfred Foster King, jr., Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Ernest Coolidge Goding, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lawrence Stanley Woods, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Edward Joseph Glynn, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Vincent Coughlin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Macey Lillard Dill, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edgar Peter Sorensen, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 Second Lieut. Edward Julius Renth, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Rudolph Kaiser, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Richard Townsend, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. George Head Duff, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John Henry Harrington, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 Second Lieut. Francis Firmin Fainter, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Wilbert Ramsey, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Peter Girardeau Marshall, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Oldys, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Karol Bronislaw Kozlowski, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Louis Moss Hitchcock, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Mateo Mananjaya Capinpin, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Herbert Foster Wilkinson, Quartermaster Corps.  
 Second Lieut. Walter Norman Clinton, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Martin Burtis Dunbar, Quartermaster Corps.  
 Second Lieut. Malcolm Byrne, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Raymond Charles Blatt, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Fred William Fallin, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Francis Hill, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Edward Brigham McKinley, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles John Kalberer, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Floy Lyle Hester, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Penderton Glandon, Quartermaster Corps.  
 Second Lieut. Claude Mitchell Adams, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Walter Patrick O'Brien, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Francis Taylor, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Lester Levi Boggs, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Calvin Sutton Richards, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John Thomas Fleming, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Ira Harry Treest, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. Philip Boswell Tallaferro, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Glenn C. Oppy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Brevard Hayne, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Reed Bartlett, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Pickens, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Drummond Hughes, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Lewis Evans Reigner, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Oscar Nelson Schjerven, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Harry Ernest Menezes, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Levin Arthur Bowland, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. William Leslie Brown, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Clyde Clarkson Way, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Ephriam Harrison, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. William Henry Brady, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Gregory Brey, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Don Richman Norris, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Ben Butler Blair, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Lawrence Gibson Forsythe, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. John Alfred Hatfield, Quartermaster Corps.  
 Second Lieut. Humphrey Swygart Evans, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Randolph DeVall, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lewis Frederick Kosch, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. William Richard Maris, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Marion Lyman Young, Field Artillery.



First Lieut. George Irvin Smith, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Averill Hill, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Everard Franklin Olsen, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Irving Devance Offer, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Francis Doran, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Benning Sinclair, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Melvin Earl Gillette, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Oliver Felton Porter, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Severne Spence MacLaughlin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Frederic Marquat, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Willis Aubrey Hedden, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Allison Ware Jones, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Godfrey Neil Wyke, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Howard Herndon Davis, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. George Eltie Hartman, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Oscar Julian Brittle Whitehurst, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Philip Frederick Biehl, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. James Gasper Devine, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 Second Lieut. Ralph Eldon Harrington, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Richard Bocock Willis, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Burton Francis Hood, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Howard Nathaniel Frissell, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Patrick Eugene Shea, Field Artillery.  
 Second Lieut. Edward Samuel Garner, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Earl Elliott Major, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lloyd Chandler Parsons, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Henry Vaughn Dexter, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Hans Ernest Kloefer, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Edward Allen Everitt, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ted Harold Cawthorne, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Erwin Adolph Manthey, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Edward Harrah, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Henry Bartow Dawson, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John William Kelley, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Robert William Corrigan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Hughes Lord, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Archibald Ross McKechnie, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Paul Ratay, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Mose Kent Pigman, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Claude Tillinghast Porter, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Reed Emil Beck, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Norman Norton Rogers, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Waldo Emerson Ard, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Harry William Maas, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Fenton Gay Epling, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Rutherford Loren Herr, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Herbert Gray Esden, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Peter Townsend Cox, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Francis Henry Boucher, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. William Henry Sweet, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Louis Cansler, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ross Gordon Hoyt, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. William Van Dyke Ochs, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Bentley Mayer, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Harold Kernan, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Hunter Louis Girault, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Hubert Augustine McMorro, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. George Albert Jackson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Innes Harwood Bodley, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Lee Louis Elzas, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Owen George Fowler, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Foster, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Alexander Carl Strecker, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Wade Hampton Johnson, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Francis Ward Kernan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Dwight Hughes, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Robert Stickman, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Maximilian Clay, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frederick Sandrus Schmitt, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Calvert Hinton Arnold, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. George Shively Prugh, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frederick Meyer Vinson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Homer Franklin Tate, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Montague, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Richard Hutchings Johnston, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Blakeway Cockburn, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Clifton Martin Brown, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Otto Walter Neidert, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lloyd William Biggs, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Showalter Beall, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Wilkie Collins Burt, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ralph Emerson Bower, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Adrian Beaumont Charles Smith, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Wesley Ogden, Infantry.

First Lieut. George Leland Eberle, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Rufus Stanley Ramey, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Douglas Graeme Clark, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Marcus Brenneman Bell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Louis Joseph Fortier, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Henry Pascale, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. James Bentley Taylor, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. George Warner Swift, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Remington Orsinger, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Stewart Morris, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph William Bollenbeck, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Victor A. Dash, jr., Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Richard Henry Ballard, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Leon Chapman Dennis, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles William Chalker, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Clay Short, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Roy Crawford Moore, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. William Fred Lafrenz, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Cyrus Joseph Rounds, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Deane Forsythe, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Theodore Edward Thomas Haley, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John Franklin Hepner, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Samuel Louis Alexander, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lawrence Byron Wyant, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Albert Denarvons Johnson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leslie T. Lathrop, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Black Muir, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Lewis Augustine Maury, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Edmund Hathaway Stillman, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Robert Chapman Snidow, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Cary Howard, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ralph Edwin Richards, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ralph Hudson Wooten, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Kenneth Burman Bush, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Frederick Loomis, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles Henry Keck, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. Abraham Wright Williams, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. James Thomas Duke, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Hiram Franklin Plummer, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Watkins Ligon, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Edward Hale Brooks, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. James David Brown, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Wayland Bixby Augur, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Mark McClelland, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. William Brooks Bradford, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Arnold Wilkinson Shutter, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Abram Franklin Kibler, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Cecil Ray Moore, Corps of Engineers.  
 First Lieut. Leonce Joseph Blanchard, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Francis Sylvester Conaty, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Granville Byam Smith, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Norman Lee Baldwin, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. William Edward Beitz, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Grafton Sherwood Kennedy, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. Richard Ridgely Lytle, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Caldwell Duncel, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Harold Clarkson Mabbott, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Rex Byerley Shaw, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John Waller Faulconer, jr., Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Richard Erastus Taylor, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Gennad Alban Greaves, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Robert Vansant Finney, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Francis Murry Crist, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Frank Charles Howard, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Harman Paul Agnew, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Mitchell Wiener, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Lucas Elmendorf Schoonmaker, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. William Fergus Kernan, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Gordon Marshall Wells, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Don Carlos Faith, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Raymond Orr, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Hermon French Safford, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Clifford Dean Hindle, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Adam Austin, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Morrill Ross, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Vernon McTyeire Shell, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Roland Legard Davis, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. John Averill Steere, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. James William Anderson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leslie Edwards Babcock, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Francis Howard Wilson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Charles Longino, Cavalry.

- First Lieut. Walter Adams Mack, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Cleary Kernan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Maxton Hale Flint, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Howard Jennings Gorman, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Eugene Peter Henry Gempel, Chemical Warfare Service.  
 First Lieut. Charles Swett Pettee, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Elmer Ellsworth Hagler, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leon Adolph Des Pland, jr., Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John Melville Sanderson, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Sidney Hamlet Negrotto, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Gustav Joseph Braun, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Henry Egle Holmes, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Lindley Gammell, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Charles William Walton, Chemical Warfare Service.  
 First Lieut. Douglas Meriwether Griggs, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. James Vincent McConville, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ward Hale Maris, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Hugh John Fitzgerald, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Everett Langdon Upson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Paul Jacobs, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Paul Joseph Matte, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Cornelius Henry Menger, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. Don Forrester Pratt, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Rush Hawes, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Henry Seymour, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Shelburn Robinson, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Willard Allen Reddish, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Ernest Ransome Percy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Murray Henry Ellis, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Sherwood Holmes Taber, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Wolcott Paige Hayes, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ernest Cleveland Bomar, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Lawrence Augustus Shafer, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Donovan Paul Yeuell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Edward Atkinson, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Thurlby Morgan Rundel, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Bernard Beeler Bubb, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Joseph McIntyre, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Gustave Bismark Guenther, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Edward Benedict McCarthy, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Leslie Frederick Lawrence, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Horace Waldo Forster, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Hubert Randle, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Simpson Ridley Stribling, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. Francis Marion Rich, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Gowdy Watson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leon Franklin Sullivan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Waldemar Adolph Falck, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Clark Armstrong, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carl John Rohsenberger, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Barber Townsend, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Hunter McGuire, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Richard Derby, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. James Veto McDowell, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Steven Bayard Wilson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Thomas Campbell, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Howard Spencer McKirdy, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Ralph Rinker, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Lee Hart, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Henry Gibson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Washington Gering, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Henry Beals Bogman, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Earl Ditmars, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Harold Gallier, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Percy Stuart Haydon, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Ernest Aldridge, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Blake Crabill, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edmund Walton Hill, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Albert Edward McIntosh, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Alfred Marston Shearer, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Jefferson Kinney, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Halbert Hale Neilson, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Leland Charles McAuley, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. James Obadiah Tarbox, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Truman Everett Boudinot, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Raymond Frank Edwards, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Maurice Eugene Barker, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Oren Anelen Mulkey, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Chester Bond, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Stephen Boon, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Glaucus Holt, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Roy Vernon Morledge, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Alexis McClure, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Francis Brown McCollom, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Benton Wirt, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Graham Roscoe Schweickert, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Gordon Hutchinson, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Chester Paul Dorland, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Archie E. Groff, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. George Davis Wiltshire, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Alfonso Frederick Zerbe, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur John Wehr, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Wannie Lee Bartley, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Norman John McMahon, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Donald Morris Bartow, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Paul Louis Singer, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Louis Ready, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lloyd Russell Rogers, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. Earl Coulson Flegel, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Herbert Blish Wheeler, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Carroll Nathan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Joseph Lacouture, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Wilbur Storm Elliott, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Kirke Brooks Lawton, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. Neil Smith Edmond, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Haney, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Martin DeWitt McAllister, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Henry Colbern, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Marcel Alfred Gillis, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John William Carroll, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Joshua Shelton Bowen, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leighton Coleman Worthington, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. David James Daly, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Floyd Merritt Hyndman, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ira Claude Nicholas, Infantry.  
 Second Lieut. Clarence Walter Richmond, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Jett Powell, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Lorenzo Lamont Snow, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. William Herbert Murphy, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. John Bryce Casseday, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. John Francis Hanley, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ben Stafford, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Theose Elwin Tillinghast, Air Service.  
 Second Lieut. Daniel J. Dunn, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Dover Bell, Field Artillery.  
 Second Lieut. Harry Leroy Black, Philippine Scouts.  
 Second Lieut. Harold Lester Egan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Lawrence Conway, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Yuditsky, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Tussey, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. George Aloysius O'Donnell, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Albert Barnett Jones, Corps of Engineers.  
 First Lieut. Hamilton Thorn, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Sutherland Claussen, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Aloysius Hasson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Edward Jones, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Louis Leonard Chatkin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Clarence Howard Kells, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Ragan Priest, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. David Cleveland Kelly, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Frank Henry Hollingsworth, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Randolph Russell, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Philip Ramer, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Brock Putnam, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Keelah Bouvé, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Miles Sumner, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Henry Green, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Francis M. Fuller, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harold de Beaumont Bruck, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Sidney Abdiel Sands, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Donald Anderson Young, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Hans Charles Minuth, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Christian Allen Schwarzwaelder, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Clarence Gere, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. George Gill Ball, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Putnam Detwiler, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Clarence Francis Hofstetter, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. George Stanley Victor Little, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Lawrence Bolte, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Eugene Crehan Callahan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Paul Sheeley Roper, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Theodore Francis Wessels, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Sherman Kennedy Burke, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur John McChrystal, Infantry.



First Lieut. Malcolm Fraser Lindsey, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Jean Elsworth Nelson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Horace Oscar Cushman, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harley Latson, Corps of Engineers.  
 First Lieut. William Maine Hutson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Maury Galbreath, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Robert Kilbourne, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Phillips, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. David Henry Finley, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Clifford Arthur Eastwood, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Vinton Lee James, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Franklin Campbell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Stuart Cutler, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Reuben Boatwright, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lester Nelson Allyn, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Henry Lester Barrett, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Archibald Donald Fiske, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Fenton Stratton Jacobs, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Raymond Rolland Tourtillott, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Albert Hadd, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Parnell Cronwell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Bernard Paul Hoey, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Catesby ap Catesby Jones, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Sanford Dole Ashford, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. William McBlair Garrison, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Eustace Peabody Strout, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Wallace William Parker, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Laird Craig, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Ray Moxey Hare, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Francis Mullins, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Henry Lord Page King, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles Wharton, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Harry William Koster, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Glenn Howenstein Stough, Corps of Engineers.  
 First Lieut. Charles Ernest Loucks, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. W. Dirk Van Ingen, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Herbert Vaughan Scanlan, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Alfred James McMullin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Gerald Leonard Marsh, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Philip Seneff, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Russell Gordon Ayers, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Allen Wappenstein, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Hayden Owens, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carter Collins, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Hugh McCauley Cochran, 3d, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. George Edwin Abrams, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Clifton Rodes Breckinridge, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Albert Dickinson Foster, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ercil Dale Porter, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Jack Adams, Corps of Engineers.  
 First Lieut. Claude Alfred White, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Franklin Farnsworth, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Paul Jamison Hunt, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. William Booth Van Anken, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Archer Lynn Lerch, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Arthur Pierce, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Wendell Lapsley Clemenson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Moses William Pettigrew, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Walter Francis Kraus, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles James Deahl, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Macdonald Ogden, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arcadi Gluckman, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Dale Milton Hoagland, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Maurice Webster Ocheltree, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Roy Thomas Rouse, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ivan Benson Snell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lester Martin Kilgarif, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. James Wilson Rice, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Polk Gammon, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Irving Gibbon, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Henry Kirke White, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Howard Forrest Long, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Burton Curtis Andrus, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Henry Besse, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Lafayette Warren, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Merritt Halstead Greene, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Irwin Lytle Lummis, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ary Clay Berry, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Mark Milton Serum, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. Arthur William Gower, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Taylor Lewis, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Ross Breckon Warren, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Walter David Luplow, Corps of Engineers.

First Lieut. Samuel Lusker McCroskey, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Arvid Paul Croonquist, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Edward Cole, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Oliver Boone Bucher, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Clarence Ames Martin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Francis Stuart Swett, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Henning Linden, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Trevor Washington Swett, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Eugene Dodge, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. George Read, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Taylor Brotherton, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Miles Whitney Kresge, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Robert Whipple Wilson, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Leslie Norman Ross, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ralph de Poix Terrell, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Walter Alexander Dumas, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Emerson Keatley, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Worcester Ricker, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. William Blackburn White, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Comfort Parkhurst, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Don Magruder Scott, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Edward Wharton, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Stephen Mahon, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Kenneth Leeds Holmes-Brown, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. Harvey Ernest Ragland, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Martin Dunlap Barndollar, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Francis Clark Lewis, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lewis Simons, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Harold Day, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Jester Davis, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. George William Outland, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. Hiram Russell Ide, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Mead Silkman, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Loren Archibald Wetherby, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Joseph Coghlan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Bernard Butler McMahon, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Edwin Fingarson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Stanley Raymond Mickelsen, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. James Patrick Kelly, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Elwood Miller Stokes Steward, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ernest Albert Rudelius, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Lee Blanton, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Eugene Sturcken, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. John Brainard Fidler, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. Wilbur Burnette Sumner, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Brady, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Porter Pise Wiggins, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Gilbert Xavier Cheves, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Paul Bacon Matlock, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Edward Corkill, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John Thomas Zellars, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Richard Alfred McClure, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carroll Gowen Riggs, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles Donald Brown, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John Adams Ballard, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Herbert Towle Perrin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Emons Bert Whisner, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Wesley Griner, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Douglas Lee Crane, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Hugh Tullock Mayberry, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Wade Carpenter Gatchell, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Newton Blue, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Fredric Harris Timmerman, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Moses McKay Darst, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Staples Robertson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Amos Eugene Carmichael, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Samuel O'Connor Neff, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Philip Edward Brown, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Andrew Jackson Wynne, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Olaf Phillips Winningstad, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. Winfred Charles Green, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Marion Irwin Voorhes, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. George Arthur Davis, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Van Wyck Pope, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Ellsworth Butler, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edgar Lewis Clewell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Frank Goodman, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Herbert Fritz Ernst Bultman, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Leon Draper Gibbens, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ralph King Learnard, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Robert Alexander Kinloch, Infantry.

- First Lieut. Joel Rankin Burney, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Wilton Burton Persons, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Campbell Nelson Jackson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Homer Case, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Henry Gardner, jr., Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Earl Cranston Ewert, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Donald Degray Demarest, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Ralph Merton McFaul, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Bird Little, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lucian King Truscott, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Einar Walter Chester, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Allen Griffin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Guy Cummins McKinley, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Gordon Prescott Savage, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Hugh McClune, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lester Earl MacGregor, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Pearson Gibson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lloyd Ross Besse, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lieut. James Hugh Akerman, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Hugh Merle Elmendorf, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Fearn Sutherland, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Gilbert Everhard Parker, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Francis Beeston Myer, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Seymour Nevins, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John George Murphy, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Gustave Villaret, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Sanders Van Deusen, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Andrew Stewart Messick, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. William Lawrence Phillips, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Joe Jene Miller, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. George Alfred Hunt, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Johnson McSherry, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Gabriel Requa Mead, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. John Ernest Dahlquist, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Russell Symonds Fisher, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Eugene Farthing, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Tom Sherman Brand, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Morris Ankorn, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Robinson Urquhart, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Morrill Watson Marston, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Edward Bergin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Otis Crose, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Calvin Butner, jr., Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Benjamin Wilson Venable, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Lawrence Murphy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edward Stanley Ott, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Ralph Bridges Bagby, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Melvin Leslie McCreary, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Allan Hanson Snowden, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Herman Hollie Felix Gossett, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Lester Johnson Whitlock, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Burt Eugene Skeel, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Henry Augustus Brickley, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Roger Wisner, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. A. Pledger Sullivan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Lee Campbell, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Kay Christmas, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Harvey Edward, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. Leo James McCarthy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Earl Franklin Paynter, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ernest Arthur Williams, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. George Price Hays, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. George Harrison Millholland, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Harrison Bruce Beavers, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Herbert Daskum Gibson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Squire Wilbur, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ralph Julian Canine, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Paul Blassengame Robinson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Lamont Coulter, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Henry Hinwood, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Russell Fleming Walthour, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Crawford DeLong, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Timothy Asbury Pedley, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Donald Ross Dunkle, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. James Sullins Varnell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Chester Earl Davis, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Turner Bowden, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Cassius Hayward Styles, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Holmes Gill Paullin, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ransom Davis Spann, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Ray Edison Porter, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Exley Barber, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Earl Brannan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Castle Hawkins, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Hamilton Irving, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Alfred Pruden Kelley, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Oliver Ferguson Marston, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Evan Dhu Cameron, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Clarence Clemons Park, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Glenn Smith Finley, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Volney Rattan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Rossell Eric Hardy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Manly Foster Meador, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Zim E. Lawhon, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Lloyd Zuppann, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Kirkland Rice, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Hammond Davies Birks, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Holden Hagan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lester Smith Ostrander, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Wesley Card, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Clarence Beryl Werts, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Roscoe Bunyan Ellis, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Milton Conroy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Spurgeon Johnson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Manly Broadus Gibson, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles Henry Hagelstein, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Harold Keatinge, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Hugh Andrew Wear, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Allan Miller, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. David Loring, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Warren Andrews, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Stockbridge Carleton Hilton, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Russell Phipp, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. George Anthony Horkan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Herman Unger, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Harold Soderholm, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. Samuel Cranmer Thompson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Winant Caygill, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Elson Jeffres, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Vennard Wilson, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Orlo Harry Quinn, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Lewis Anderson Page, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Albert Webster Long, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Cedric Ezra Scheerer, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Alexander Oscar Gorder, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Geoffrey Marshall, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Percy Custer Fleming, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Edward Maynard Fickett, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Jennings Guilbeau, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Francis Roehm, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Milo Victor Buchanan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Kearle Lee Berry, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Elbridge Chickering, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Nathan David Gordon, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Wilbur Reece McReynolds, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Howell Redd Hanson, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. George Robert Hayman, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Howard Everett Camp, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Gaillard Pinckney, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Couzens Van Ingen, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Benjamin Franklin O'Connor, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Fred Currie Milner, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Frost Craig, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lloyd Smith Partridge, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Oscar K. Wolber, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Tillory Andrews, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Callie Hammond Palmer, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Karl Eugene Henion, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harold Whittle Blakeley, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. George Etter, Quartermaster Corps.  
 First Lieut. George Orial Clark, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Russell J. Potts, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Hoover Craig, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Thaddeus Clarence Knight, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Olle William Reed, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Levi Monroe Bricker, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. John Pehrson MacNeill, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Louis Wilson Maddox, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Clyde Githero, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lieut. James Gauding Watkins, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Christopher Strawn, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Fulton Magill, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Paul Mitchell Arnold, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Harry Curry, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert John Wagoner, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Edgar Vernon, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Sam Williams Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Williams McCall, Infantry.



First Lieut. Thomas Brevard Steel, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Alfred Joseph DeLorimer, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Everett Busch, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Wilbur Heisse, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Taylor, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Stewart Darden Hervey, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lieut. Frank Joyce Pearson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lester Thomas Miller, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leo Donovan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Cerald Cole, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Julian Gilliam Hart, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Randall Thomas Kendrick, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Walter Ewing, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Percy McCay Vernon, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Clyde Le Gage Walker, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Milton Whitney, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Emile James Boyer, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Richard Earl Tallant, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Peter J. Lloyd, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Henry Hale Cheshire, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Theodore Morton Cornell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Paul Vincent Kellogg, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Sylvester Peters, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Herbert Ludwell Earnest, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ivy Winfred Crawford, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Spurgeon Harris, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Reed Hodge, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Richard Walk, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leslie Egner Toole, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Francis Murray Brady, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Paul Wolcott Rutledge, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Eubert Harrison Malone, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ray Tyson Maddocks, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. James Footville Butler, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Richard Nelson Atwell, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Bayne Locke, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Truman Morris Martin, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Morris Simpson Daniels, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Chester Bailey McCoid, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Cecil Leland Rutledge, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Theodore Christian Gerber, Ordnance Department.  
 First Lieut. Garth Bly Haddock, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lawrence Leonard William Meinzen, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Marshall Lawrence Gosserand, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. John Orland Lawrence, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. George LeConte Ramsey, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Johnson Albright, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Williamson Glover, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Robert Jones King, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Alexander Adair, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Grant Alexander Schlieker, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Knox Galley, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Grant Hilliard, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Albert Cushing Cleveland, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leslie Marshall Skerry, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Walter Carper Phillips, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Anthony Joseph Touart, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Henry Percy Gray, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Dan Harold Riner, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Morriss Browning, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Edmund Easterbrook, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Harry John Collins, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Van Valkenburgh Shufelt, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Henry Paul Hallowell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Hobart Raymond Gay, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Rutherford Leon Hammond, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Oscar Dubois McNeely, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Parker Gillespie Tenney, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Robert Ernest Archibald, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Jeffries Betts, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Buhl Moore, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Mordaunt Verne Turner, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Norman E. Waldron, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Adrian Robert Brian, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Herbert Johnson Burke, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Burton Loren Lucas, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Morris Clinton Handwerk, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Walter Russell Ketcham, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Stephen Wear, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lieut. Leo Lawrence Gocker, Cavalry.

First Lieut. Benjamin Franklin Harmon, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Walter Throckmorton Scott, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Wilds Godbold, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. John Wilson O'Daniel, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Gilbert White, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Harry Frank Thompson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Raymond Carmichael Gibbs, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Carl McKee Innis, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Henry Allen, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leo Francis Crane, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph William McKenna, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Raymond Blanton Bottom, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Alfred Grace Ford, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Henry Terry Morrison, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Paul Leon Porter, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Stanley Joseph Grogan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Rohland Andrew Isker, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Reginald Maxwell, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Leonard Roscoe Crews, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles Arthur Horger, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Stonewall Jackson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Conrad Grey Wall, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Warner Beardsley Gates, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Oscar Joseph Neundorfer, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charlie Edward Hart, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Webster Hamlin Warren, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Ross Berry Smith, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Brown Bethea, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Bennett Woodburn, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles William Higgins, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Hugh Nathan Herrick, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Stanley French Griswold, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Thomas Dibrell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edmund Jones Lilly, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Edward Dissinger, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Garlot Hannon, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Edwin Hull, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Francis Bresnahan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Koger Marion Still, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Samuel White, jr., Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Gilman Kimball Crockett, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Warren Wertz, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Edison Roderick, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Wallace Alan Mead, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ray Winfield Harris, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lieut. Elbert Wilson Lockwood, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Evans Read Crowell, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Robinson Earl Duff, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leon Wilcomb Hilliard, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. Walter Colon Blalock, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Hamilton Johnston, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Raymond Godfrey Lehman, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Irvine Callander Scudder, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Chester Bates, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Harry Edmund Pendleton, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Claude Briggs, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Paul Samuel Beard, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edgardo Vazquez-Bruno, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Wright Helm Johnson, Signal Corps.  
 First Lieut. George William Clover, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edwin Allan Smith, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Gyles Merrill, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Copers Bowie, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Wilfred Ernest Willis, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Floyd C. Harding, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Rolfe Saunders Sample, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Montagu Adamson, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas William Conrad, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Percy Lee Sadler, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Luther Morrow, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Everhart Sheldrake, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Frederick Wilhelm Hoorn, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Joe Carroll Rogers, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Evan Marshall Sherrill, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Wylie Arnold, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Albert Allen, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Carson Stephens, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Bernard Franklin Hurless, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Guy Orth Kurtz, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Louis Joseph Compton, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. John Henry Hildring, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Donald McMillin, Infantry.

- First Lieut. Arthur Breckinridge Wade, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. James Gideon Kyle, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Hurst Rodman, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Dan Powell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Read Wipprecht, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Ceylon Otto Griffin, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Charles Louisell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Wade Herren, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Alden Humphrey Seabury, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Jesse Eckard Whitt, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Emanuel Goe, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Donald Brooks Hilton, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Clarence Arthur Shannon, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Alexander Bull McNabb, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Leonard Bitter, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Winchell Patterson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ralph Edwin Hill, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Francis Lancaster Christian, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles Henry Sears, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Walton Whittingham Cox, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Druid Emmet Wheeler, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Royall Lugton, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Maitland Bottoms, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Michael Johann Perret, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ross Ernest Larson, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. William Robinson Epes, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Stewart Elvin Reimel, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Kendall Jordan Fielder, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Curtis Deware, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Hugh Donald Adair, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Charles Harrington Stewart, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Robbins Bibb, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Reginald Reuben Bacon, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Russell Conwell Snyder, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. David Broome Van Pelt, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harvey Allan Tonnesen, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edward Ramsey Holland, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. William Hubbell Emerson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Eddy Cook, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Tolmie Watson, jr., Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Eugene Hill Mitchell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Wesley Russey, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Donald Stevens Grimm, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Dennett McIntyre, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Walter Michael Eugene Sullivan, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Allan James Kennedy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Bryan Lee Milburn, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Martin Luther Howard, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Nyal L. Adams, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Virgil Norberto Cordero, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Leo Joseph Farrell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Walter Shea Wood, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Owen Stephens, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Henry Quarterman, jr., Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Benjamin Brandon Bain, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ira Clarence Eaker, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Stanton Louis Bertschey, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Romeyn Beck Hough, jr., Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Fred Paul Clark, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Cheney Litton Berthoff, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ellsworth Young, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Harold LaRoy King Albro, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Edward Reese Roberts, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Walter Ernst Lauer, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Hitch Pritchard, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Albert Hugh Dumas, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Paul Shober Jones, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Paul Thompson Baker, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Porter Bell, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harold William Keller, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Edwin William Piburn, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Kenneth Stoddard Whitemore, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Mack Morgan Lynch, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Jerry Vrchlicky Matejka, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Frank Huber Partridge, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Franklin Knight Kennedy, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Gerald FitzGerald, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Derril de Saussure Trenholm, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Michael Edmond Halloran, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Idwal Hubert Edwards, Air Service.  
 First Lieut. Paul James Vevia, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Carl Julian Dockler, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Milton Heilfron, Corps of Engineers.  
 First Lieut. Olin Coke Newell, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. James Barclay Smith, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Paule Steele, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Luther Nathaniel Johnson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Stanley Augustus Anderson, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Emmett Cummings, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Fayette Schoonover, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Adam Jackson Bennett, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Louis Simmonds Stickney, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Hesketh, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. James Larkin Dikes, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lieut. Ben Curtis McComas, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Kenneth Benjamin Gunn, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Maurice Garver Stubbs, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Archibald Andrew Fall, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Romaine Schucker, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Stewart Warren, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. John Leo Davey, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Ralph Charles Thomas, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Joseph William Vann, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Mario Cordero, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Henry Oscar Swindler, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Haskell Allison, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Minor Lille, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Bruce Glenn Kirk, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Davis Jones, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Russell Skinner, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. George Warren Dunn, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Tillinghast Huston, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. John Alexander Klein, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Harold Luse, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Clayton Seraska Whitehead, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Arthur Swift, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Edwin Grose, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Creighton Wright, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Everett Latimer Rice, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Lawrence Archie Kurtz, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Daniel Webster Hickey, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Martin Stevenson Chester, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. William Connor Samford, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Harry Reichelderfer, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Alexander Russell Bolling, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Duncan Thomas Boisseau, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. James Leonard Garza, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Dunbar Chambliss, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Roger Eugene Williams, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Frank Reid Baker, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Elvin Leon Barr, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Douglas Eaton Morrison, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Thomas Eugene Jeffords, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Amory Oliver, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Clarence Webb Dresser, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Frank Hendricks Hastings, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Joseph Hiram Gilbreth, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Harold Gilbert Archibald, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Daniel Howe Hoge, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Reamer Walker Argo, Coast Artillery Corps, subject to examination required by law.  
 First Lieut. Eugene Thomas Conway, Coast Artillery Corps.  
 First Lieut. Frederick Adelmar Ward, Philippine Scouts.  
 First Lieut. Ralph Hirsch, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. William Joseph Egan, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Talley Dozier Joiner, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Victor Maraist, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Lawrence Patterson, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Lester Hardee Barnhill, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Sterner St. Paul Meek, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Julian Vance Link, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Melvin Lewis Craig, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Elbert Arcularius Nostrand, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Samuel Gibson Stewart, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Hervey Aldrich Tribolet, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Brooks Emms, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Levie Wilson Foy, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Cord Blizzard, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Warren Henry McNaught, Field Artillery.  
 First Lieut. Howard Clark, jr., Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Roy Edson Craig, Cavalry.  
 First Lieut. Robert Ignatius Stack, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. Paul Wilbur Warren, Infantry.  
 First Lieut. John Huling, jr., Infantry.



First Lieut. Early Edward Walters Duncan, Air Service.  
First Lieut. Edward Marple Daniels, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Orryl Samuel Robles, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Philip Richard Upton, Cavalry.  
First Lieut. Horace Kelita Heath, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Harry Russell Evans, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Bartholomew Robins DeGraff, Infantry.  
First Lieut. George LaFranc O'Connor, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Harold Napoleon Gilbert, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Charles Eugene Rust, Air Service.  
First Lieut. William Albert Collier, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Archibald Miles Mixson, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Clifford Bert Cole, Field Artillery.  
First Lieut. Albert Gresham Wing, Infantry.  
First Lieut. William Fred Rehm, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Edward Nicholson Fay, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Donald Thomas Nelson, Cavalry.  
First Lieut. Thomas Graves Cherry, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Richardson Lester Greene, Field Artillery.  
First Lieut. George Clarence Nielson, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Raymond Greenleaf Sherman, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Earl Campbell Horan, Infantry.  
First Lieut. William John Henry Ryan, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Coleman Ferrell Driver, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Wallace William Millard, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Walter Wellington Von Gremp, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Arthur Grady Hutchinson, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Norman Marcus Nelsen, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Harvey Lewis Littlefield, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Ronald Lowe Ring, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Alfred Timothy Wright, Infantry.  
First Lieut. John Ainsworth Andrews, Infantry.  
First Lieut. George Andrew Lockhart, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Emerald Clark Robbins, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. James Julian Pirtle, Field Artillery.  
First Lieut. Alfred Edward Dedicke, Infantry.  
First Lieut. George Frederick Macdonald, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Harry Boissonnault, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Wilbur Ellsworth Bashore, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Harold Head, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Walter William Boon, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Hugh McCord Evans, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Michael Joseph Mulcahy, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Harold Stokely Wright, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Lois Chester Dill, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Edward James Maloney, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Richard Abram Jones, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Lloyd Dexter Yates, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Hugh Barclay, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Lawrence William Jenkinson, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Nelson Macy Walker, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Milton Brandt Goodyear, Infantry.  
First Lieut. William Ewart Gladstone Graham, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Jesse Ralston Lippincott, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Lee Sommerville Dillon, Corps of Engineers.  
First Lieut. Ralph Mills, Corps of Engineers.  
First Lieut. Peter Edward Bernel, Corps of Engineers.  
First Lieut. Carl Raymond Shaw, Corps of Engineers.  
First Lieut. Theron DeWitt Weaver, Corps of Engineers.  
First Lieut. Frederick Franklyn Frech, Corps of Engineers.  
First Lieut. John Elliott Wood, Corps of Engineers.  
First Lieut. Harry Ray Springer, Quartermaster Corps.  
Second Lieut. William Riley Maynard, Air Service.  
Second Lieut. Robert Johnson Van Epps, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Raymond Donaldson Smith, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. William Minnis Pierce, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Arthur Bothwell Proctor, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Robert Lee Cox, Cavalry.  
First Lieut. William Thombs Kilborn, jr., Quartermaster Corps.

First Lieut. Frank Harry Scheiner, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Carlos Oscar Cooley, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Frank Merritt Harshberger, Cavalry.  
First Lieut. Leighton E. Worthley, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Francis Joseph McNamara, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Frank Watts Arnold, Cavalry.  
First Lieut. Harrison Sheldon Beecher, Cavalry.  
First Lieut. Wesley Wright Price, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Erskine Burt Halley, Field Artillery.  
First Lieut. Mortimer Clark Addoms, jr., Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Charles Clarke Loughlin, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Gill McCook, Cavalry.

First Lieut. Gilbert Rieman, Cavalry.  
First Lieut. Percy Adams, Coast Artillery Corps.  
First Lieut. Jefferson Milford Stewart, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Howard Kirkbride Dilts, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Joseph Benjamin Varela, Coast Artillery Corps.  
First Lieut. Walter Floyd Brown, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Manning Wilfred Spotswood, Quartermaster Corps.

First Lieut. George Cook Hollingsworth, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Joel Franklin Watson, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. John Conrad Hutcheson, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Charles Wilshire Older, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. William Downing Wheeler, Air Service.  
First Lieut. Herbert Wheeler Worcester, Cavalry.  
First Lieut. David Ransom Wolverton, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. George Ray Ford, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Frank Gosnell, jr., Field Artillery.  
First Lieut. John Vincent Rowan, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. William Henry Beers, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Willis Dodge Cronkhite, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. John Alexander Russell, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Theodore Tyler Barnett, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. William Addison Ray, Field Artillery.  
First Lieut. Lloyd Spencer Spooner, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Henry Mills Shoemaker, Cavalry.  
First Lieut. Harry Tolman Partridge, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Eugene Erwin Morrow, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Kinsley Wilcox Slauson, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Fred Tenderholm Neville, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. James Hugh Conlin, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Cyril Wilhelm Van Cortlandt, Quartermaster Corps.

First Lieut. Cornelius Cole Brown, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Joseph Patrick Kelly, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Edgar Kehler Brockway, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Wallace Earle Hackett, Infantry.  
First Lieut. William Lane Tydings, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Ernest Klein White, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. George William West, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Augustus Spencer Harrison, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Harry Coleman Snyder, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Franklin B. Lees, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Benton Arthur Doyle, Air Service.  
First Lieut. George Henry Shea, Cavalry.  
Second Lieut. Edward John Lewis Russell, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Archie Ellsworth Phinney, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Fritz M. Dyer, Infantry.  
First Lieut. John Nettleton Johnson, jr., Infantry.  
First Lieut. Edward Flagg Sweeney, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Ralph Reynolds Seger, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. Henry Frederick Wunder, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Taylor Worcester Foreman, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Philip Joseph O'Brien, Quartermaster Corps.  
First Lieut. George Leroy King, Infantry.  
First Lieut. Floyd William Ferree, Infantry.

#### MEDICAL CORPS.

##### To be captains.

First Lieut. Alexander Mileau, jr., Medical Corps, from June 18, 1920.  
First Lieut. Leonard Philip Bell, Medical Corps, from June 22, 1920.  
First Lieut. Thomas Grant Tousey, Medical Corps, from July 14, 1920.  
First Lieut. Frank Walker Young, Medical Corps, from July 16, 1920.  
First Lieut. Roy Farrington Brown, Medical Corps, from July 25, 1920.  
First Lieut. John Glenwood Knauer, Medical Corps, from August 8, 1920.  
First Lieut. Clark Anson Wilcox, Medical Corps, from August 8, 1920.  
First Lieut. Edwin Raymond Strong, Medical Corps, from August 27, 1920.  
First Lieut. Henry Jackson Hayes, Medical Corps, from August 31, 1920.  
First Lieut. Edwin Leland Brackney, Medical Corps, from September 3, 1920.  
First Lieut. Rufus Leroy Holt, Medical Corps, from September 8, 1920.  
First Lieut. Ernest Jackson Steves, Medical Corps, from November 22, 1920.  
First Lieut. William John Meihe, Medical Corps, from September 3, 1920.

First Lieut. Morgan Clint Berry, Medical Corps, from September 3, 1920.

First Lieut. Anthony Avata, Medical Corps, from September 10, 1920.

First Lieut. William Joseph Froitzheim, Medical Corps, from September 10, 1920.

First Lieut. Othel Jefferson Gee, Medical Corps, from September 10, 1920.

First Lieut. William Humes Houston, Medical Corps, from September 10, 1920.

First Lieut. Fabian Lee Pratt, Medical Corps, from September 10, 1920.

First Lieut. Lincoln Frank Putnam, Medical Corps, from September 10, 1920.

First Lieut. Thomas Hill Stewart, jr., Medical Corps, from September 11, 1920.

First Lieut. Eli Edwin Brown, Medical Corps, from September 11, 1920.

First Lieut. Wilbur Gibson Jenkins, Medical Corps, from September 11, 1920.

First Lieut. Richard Turberville Arnest, Medical Corps, from September 13, 1920.

First Lieut. Maxwell Gordon Keeler, Medical Corps, from September 18, 1920.

First Lieut. Jesse Cortena McKean, Medical Corps, from September 23, 1920.

First Lieut. Daniel Franklin, Medical Corps, from September 29, 1920.

First Lieut. Orlando Jefferson Posey, Medical Corps, from October 9, 1920.

First Lieut. Antony Joseph Greco, Medical Corps, from October 9, 1920.

First Lieut. Dalmar Rowley Blakely, Medical Corps, from October 10, 1920.

First Lieut. Charles Fletcher Davis, Medical Corps, from December 12, 1920.

First Lieut. David Wade Bedinger, Medical Corps, from December 29, 1920.

First Lieut. James Neal Williams, Medical Corps, from October 17, 1920.

First Lieut. Charles Ralph Ozias, Medical Corps, from November 6, 1920.

First Lieut. Cedric Eugene Filkins, Medical Corps, from November 16, 1920.

First Lieut. Clarence Mansfield Reddig, Medical Corps, from January 12, 1921.

First Lieut. Floyd Vern Kilgore, Medical Corps, from January 20, 1921.

First Lieut. Forrest Ralph Ostrander, Medical Corps, from January 21, 1921.

First Lieut. Walter Schneider Bennett, Medical Corps, from January 29, 1921.

First Lieut. Bernard Lipscomb Jarman, Medical Corps, from February 1, 1921.

First Lieut. Adam George Heilman, Medical Corps, from January 3, 1921.

First Lieut. Martin Robert Reiber, Medical Corps, from January 15, 1921.

First Lieut. Raymond Clyde Wolfe, Medical Corps, from January 18, 1921.

First Lieut. Harold Arthur Kirkham, Medical Corps, from January 20, 1921, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Aubin Tilden King, Medical Corps, from January 22, 1921.

First Lieut. Brooke Dodson, Medical Corps, from January 25, 1921.

First Lieut. Oswald Felix Schiffli, Medical Corps, from January 27, 1921.

First Lieut. Logan Ilk Evans, Medical Corps, from January 29, 1921.

First Lieut. Joseph Francis Gallagher, Medical Corps, from February 8, 1921.

#### DENTAL CORPS.

##### To be captains.

First Lieut. John Nelson White, Dental Corps, from February 7, 1921.

First Lieut. William Ferdinand Scheumann, Dental Corps, from February 7, 1921.

First Lieut. Campbell Hopson Glascock, Dental Corps, from February 7, 1921.

First Lieut. William Frederic Wieck, Dental Corps, from February 7, 1921.

First Lieut. Thomas Herbert Veale, Dental Corps, from February 7, 1921.

#### SIGNAL CORPS.

To be colonel with rank from April 12, 1917.

Lieut. Col. George Owen Squier (then Chief Signal Officer, with rank of brigadier general).

#### WITHDRAWALS.

*Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 18 (legislative day of February 14), 1921.*

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Francis Joseph McConnell, Infantry.

Maj. George Francis Connolly, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. George Buckner Sharon, Infantry.

Maj. Sylvester Bonnaffon, Infantry, since retired from active service.

Capt. William Egbert Wheeler MacKinlay, Cavalry.

Capt. Roland Beverly Ellis, Cavalry.

Capt. William Bernhard Renziehausen, Cavalry.

Maj. Rex Van Den Corput, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Stanley Symmes Ross, Finance Department, with rank from August 17, 1920.

Maj. Wallace McNamara, Infantry, with rank from August 22, 1920.

Maj. Alden Max Graham, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from September 1, 1920.

Maj. Robert LeRoy Collins, Cavalry, with rank from September 3, 1920.

Maj. Irvin Lee Hunsaker, Cavalry, with rank from September 5, 1920.

Maj. Clifton Ranney Norton, Cavalry, with rank from September 10, 1920.

Maj. Charles Russell Mayo, Cavalry, with rank from September 15, 1920.

Maj. Arthur James Lynch, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from September 17, 1920.

Maj. Guy Eugene Bucker, Infantry, with rank from September 21, 1920.

Maj. Albert Stanley Fuger, Field Artillery, with rank from September 22, 1920.

#### FIELD ARTILLERY.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from May 21, 1920.

Maj. Daniel Whilldin Hand, Field Artillery.

To be majors with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Rex Van Den Corput, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Ephriam Foster Graham, Cavalry.

Capt. William Cissna Russell, Infantry.

Capt. James Saye Duesenbury, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Roy Walter Winton, Infantry.

Capt. Frederick Clifford Rogers, Infantry.

Capt. Claude DeBusby Hunt, Cavalry.

Capt. Edwin Larkin Zinn, Philippine Scouts.

Capt. John Richard Walker, Infantry.

Capt. Frederick Gilbert Dillman, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Frank Bloom, Field Artillery.

Capt. Joseph David Brown, Coast Artillery Corps.

First Lieut. Ralph Kinnear Fletcher, Infantry.

Capt. Harold Burling Sampson, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Joseph Wadsworth Viner, Cavalry.

Capt. Ernst Sedlacek, Field Artillery.

Capt. Lehman Welling Miller, Corps of Engineers.

To be captains with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Henry Stephen Hostetter, Finance Department.

Second Lieut. Emmett Crawford Morton, Finance Department.

To be captain with rank from June 10, 1920.

First Lieut. Arthur Winton Hartman, Cavalry.

To be captain with rank from June 23, 1920.

First Lieut. Anthony John Tittinger, Cavalry.

To be first lieutenant with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Grant Heniger, Philippine Scouts.

To be second lieutenant with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Ottmann William Freeborn, Infantry, United States Army.

#### INFANTRY.

To be major with rank from July 1, 1920.

William McCleave, late captain (temporary colonel), Field Artillery, Regular Army.



*To be captains with rank from July 1, 1920.*

Maj. Zion Dixon, Infantry, United States Army.  
William Roy Nelligar, late major, Infantry, United States Army.  
Gregory Vigeant, jr., late captain, Infantry, United States Army.  
Maj. John Halpin Burnes, Infantry, United States Army.

*To be first lieutenants with rank from July 1, 1920.*

First Lieut. Chowning Cauthorn, Infantry, United States Army.  
Elmer Cordes, late captain, Infantry, United States Army.  
Herschel Vespasian Johnson, late captain, Infantry, United States Army.  
Prince Edgerton Tripp, late first lieutenant, Infantry, United States Army.

*To be second lieutenant with rank from July 1, 1920.*

First Lieut. Osborne Cutler Wood, Infantry, United States Army.

#### CAVALRY.

First Lieut. Carl Francis Ellmaker to be first lieutenant with rank from July 1, 1920, Infantry, United States Army.

#### FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

William Joseph Sharp, late second lieutenant, to be second lieutenant with rank from July 1, 1920, Field Artillery, United States Army.

#### AIR SERVICE.

*To be captain with rank from July 1, 1920.*

Roy Louis Noggle, late first lieutenant, Signal Corps, United States Army.

*To be first lieutenants with rank from July 1, 1920.*

First Lieut. Rex Everett Field, Air Service, United States Army.  
First Lieut. Monroe Reynolds, Air Service, United States Army.  
First Lieut. Edgar Lee Smith, Air Service, United States Army.  
First Lieut. Henry Jerome Spalding, Air Service, United States Army.

*To be second lieutenants with rank from July 1, 1920.*

Second Lieut. Raymond Joseph Brandt, Air Service, United States Army.  
Second Lieut. William Ansel Gardner, Air Service, United States Army.  
Second Lieut. Frederick Andrew Johnson, Air Service, United States Army.

#### QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

*To be captain with rank from December 28, 1920.*

Q. M. Sergt. Charles August Bader, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, retired.

*To be first lieutenants with rank from July 1, 1920.*

Earle Raymond Adlington, late first lieutenant, Motor Transport Corps, United States Army.  
First Lieut. August Hermes Hoch, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army.  
First Lieut. Clarence Olaf Jensen, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army.  
Capt. William Pincus Katz, Chemical Warfare Service, United States Army.

*To be second lieutenants with rank from July 1, 1920.*

First Lieut. Herbert Barr, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army.  
Second Lieut. Julius Paul Kahlbaum, Infantry, United States Army.

#### MEDICAL CORPS.

*To be major.*

Charles Stanton Freedman, late major, Medical Corps, United States Army, with rank from July 1, 1920.

*To be captains.*

First Lieut. Rufus Leroy Holt, Medical Corps, from December 13, 1920.  
Clarence Lavan Bittner, late captain, Medical Corps, United States Army, with rank from July 1, 1920.  
Emanuel Giddings, late lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, United States Army, with rank from July 1, 1920.  
First Lieut. Ernest Jackson Steves, Medical Corps, from January 20, 1921.  
First Lieut. Leonard Philip Bell, Medical Corps, from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Thomas Grant Tousey, Medical Corps, from July 24, 1920.

First Lieut. Alexander Mileau, jr., Medical Corps, from September 23, 1920.

First Lieut. Frank Walker Young, Medical Corps, from October 21, 1920.

First Lieut. Roy Farrington Brown, Medical Corps, from October 30, 1920.

First Lieut. John Glenwood Knauer, Medical Corps, from November 13, 1920.

First Lieut. Clark Anson Wilcox, Medical Corps, from November 13, 1920.

First Lieut. Edwin Raymond Strong, Medical Corps, from December 2, 1920.

First Lieut. Henry Jackson Hayes, Medical Corps, from December 6, 1920.

First Lieut. Edwin Leland Brackney, Medical Corps, from December 8, 1920.

*To be first lieutenants.*

First Lieut. Paul Christopher Christian, Medical Corps, United States Army, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Elmer Abraham Rowley, late first lieutenant, Medical Corps, United States Army, with rank from July 1, 1920.

#### DENTAL CORPS.

Stanley Rankin Rayman, late first lieutenant, to be first lieutenant with rank from July 1, 1920, Dental Corps, United States Army.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 18, 1921.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., pastor of Calvary Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Thy mercy is on our side and hence all is well. Open the way when the gate is high and there is no key, and permit us to fulfill the vows of our hearts; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of no quorum. There is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ashbrook	Fairfield	Lazaro	Sears
Ayres	Fields	Lea, Calif.	Sells
Bacharach	Focht	Longergan	Siegel
Baer	Fordney	Longworth	Sisson
Bell	Gallagher	McCulloch	Slomp
Black	Gandy	McGlennan	Small
Bland, Mo.	Ganly	McKinley	Smith, Ill.
Brinson	Goldfogle	McKinley	Smith, N. Y.
Britten	Good	McLane	Steele
Burdick	Goodwin, Ark.	Maher	Stiness
Burke	Gould	Mann, S. C.	Stoll
Campbell, Kans.	Graham, Pa.	Mason	Strong, Pa.
Candler	Griest	Mead	Sullivan
Carew	Hamill	Moon	Sweet
Casey	Harrell	Mooney	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Harrison	Morin	Tinkham
Clark, Mo.	Hayden	Mudd	Upshaw
Classon	Hersman	Perlman	Vare
Copley	Hill	Phelan	Vestal
Costello	Hulings	Rafney, Ala.	Volk
Davey	Hull, Tenn.	Rafney, Henry T.	Volstead
Donovan	Jacoway	Rafney, John W.	Watkins
Dooling	James, Mich.	Randall, Calif.	Wheeler
Doremus	Johnston, N. Y.	Reavis	Wilson, Ill.
Doughton	Kennedy, Iowa	Reed, W. Va.	Wilson, Pa.
Dunn	Kennedy, R. I.	Riddick	Wise
Eagan	Kettner	Riordan	Wood, Ind.
Eagle	Kitchin	Rowan	Woodyard
Ellsworth	Klecka	Sanders, La.	
Emerson	Kreider	Scully	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and ten Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

#### GREETINGS FROM PORTO RICO.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of Porto Rico has just assembled and is in session. The speaker of the house and the president of the senate have cabled me greetings to the House of Representatives, and have asked me to present them to the House. I ask unanimous consent that they be read from the Clerk's desk and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the cablegrams referred to by him be read. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TOWNER,

*House of Representatives, Washington:*

House of representatives in session assembled requests you to express to the House the sentiments of adherence and respect of the representatives of the people of Porto Rico for the Representatives of the national sovereignty looking for that justice worthy of both in the granting of our immediate aspirations in the extension and development of our present system of government under democratic principles.

CAYETANO COLL CUCHI, *Speaker.*

Judge TOWNER,

*House of Representatives, Washington:*

Senate of Porto Rico in session assembled unanimously requests you to express to the House of Representatives the sentiments of adherence and respect of the senators of Porto Rico to the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States looking for that justice worthy of both in the granting of our immediate aspirations in the extension and development of our present system of government under democratic principles.

BARCELO, *Presidente.*

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, if it be in order, I should like to have the House express its thanks and appreciation for this patriotic and cordial message from the two houses of Porto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The motion was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, in that connection may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DYER. These communications from the Legislative Assembly of Porto Rico have been read. Are they to be referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think they need any reference.

Mr. DYER. I should think they ought to be referred to that committee, and that the request contained therein merits serious consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the motion which has been agreed to carry with it the sending of a message?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. CANNON. What is the foundation of the message? What is it that Porto Rico wants?

Mr. DYER. They ask for more liberal representation in their local government.

Mr. CANNON. I wanted to see whether this would be construed as an expression of opinion of the House that what they might consider local government according to democratic principles should be accepted by the Committee on Insular Affairs from that standpoint. I am content that the messages should go to the Committee on Insular Affairs, but they ought not to go with any expression of opinion which might cause that committee to do what might not meet with the sentiment of this House or the coming House or the people.

Mr. DYER. That was not my intention.

Mr. GARD. The motion of the gentleman from Wyoming having been adopted, does it then become the duty of the Speaker to transmit a message in reply?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he would do so whether it was his duty or not.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 15441) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the amendment of the Senate, and had appointed Mr. TOWNSEND, Mr. MOSES, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. BECKHAM, and Mr. HENDERSON as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4205) to amend section 4, chapter 1, of Title I of an act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900, as heretofore amended by section 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend section 86 of an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, to provide for additional judges, and for other judicial purposes," approved March 3, 1909, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 4903) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a bridge across Detroit River within or near the city limits of Detroit, Mich.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

February 15, 1921:

H. J. Res. 472. Joint resolution making an appropriation to continue the valuation of the property of carriers.

February 16, 1921:

H. R. 15344. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

H. R. 10920. An act declaring Platte River to be a nonnavigable stream, having been presented to the President of the United States on February 4, 1921, and not having been approved or returned to the House of Congress in which it originated within the 10 days prescribed by the Constitution, has become a law without his approval. Last day was February 16, 1921.

#### PRIVATE CALENDAR.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Which calendar is in order to-day, claims or war claims?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks preference would be given to claims. War claims had the last Private Calendar day. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar. Without motion, the Clerk will read the first bill on the calendar.

Mr. CRAMTON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I understand the statement of the Chair to be a direction to the Clerk to read the first bill. I have no objection to its being read, but I do not want to lose any rights. I want to reserve a point of order against the consideration of the first bill. If it is preferred, I will make the point of order now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the first bill.

#### MAJ. GEN. CROWDER.

The Clerk read the title to the first bill, as follows:

S. 2867. An act authorizing the President, when Maj. Gen. Crowder retires, to place him on the retired list of the Army as a lieutenant general.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that to-day bills upon the Private Calendar reported from committees on either War Claims or Claims are in order. The suggestion of the Speaker was that probably Claims had priority. My point of order is that bills reported from any other committees except Claims or War Claims are not in order until the bills having precedence are disposed of. I will be very glad to cite precedents if the Chair cares to hear them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. The rule provides that—

On Friday of each week after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, it shall be in order to entertain a motion for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House to consider business on the Private Calendar in the following order.

As I understand, the motion to go into Committee of the Whole to consider the bills on the Private Calendar could not have been made except by virtue of this rule, and the rule prescribes the order in which the bills on the calendar shall be



considered. Omitting the reference to the second and fourth Friday, the rule continues:

On every Friday, except the second and fourth Fridays, the House shall give preference to the consideration of bills reported from the Committee on Claims and the Committee on War Claims, alternating between the two committees.

The rule is as explicit, direct, and positive as it would seem possible for language to make it that at the present time in this committee in considering bills on the Private Calendar we are obliged to consider them in the following order, and under that to-day bills coming either from the Committee on Claims or War Claims have precedence. The matter has been up before in the House, and decision was made in the second session of the Sixty-third Congress, found on page 3053 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in Committee of the Whole, for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar. It was held that business on the Private Calendar reported from the committee having priority on that day, whatever the committee might be, should be disposed of before any other business on the Private Calendar should be considered. That decision is in harmony with other decisions that are equally explicit. For instance, it was held in 1901, which decision the Chair will find reported in Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, section 4913, that in Committee of the Whole the rule of procedure prescribed by the House may not be set aside. The House has prescribed a definite and positive rule of procedure in this case, that certain bills shall have precedence for consideration. That rule having been prescribed by the House, the Committee of the Whole has no authority to set it aside.

It is somewhat analogous to the case of fixing debate by the House in which it is repeatedly held that fixing debate by the whole House, the Committee of the Whole can not, even by unanimous consent, agree to an extension contrary to that order of the House.

I am aware that there are some precedents for the making of a motion to set aside the particular order of business. Such a case is reported in Hinds, volume 4, section 4730, but that, it should be noted by the Chair, was under an old rule of the House in which the right to change the order was expressly given to the committee. Under the present rule the right is negatived, the House has fixed a priority, and taken discretion away from the committee.

There are some other precedents, one in Hinds, volume 4, section 4731, which was also under the old form of rule. But the one in section 4732 under the changed form of rule, the motion there had reference to taking a bill out of order that came from the committee that had the priority right.

Now, what is attempted here is not to take up a bill reported from the Claims Committee and consider it out of turn, but to take up a bill from a committee that has no priority rights to-day, and hence these decisions are not at all in conflict with the ones reported in section 4734, or the one decided by Chairman Adair.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, of course I have no contention with the gentleman from Michigan who has addressed the Chair on the point he has made. But I think the rulings have been to the effect that notwithstanding the rule which gives priority to war claims and claims on this day, that it is within the rights of the Chair to entertain a motion to consider a certain bill not included in claims or war claims.

The Hamlin decision, I think the Chair will find, held that it is quite proper to make a motion to consider any bill on the Private Calendar, and it is for the committee to decide whether or not that bill, whatever it may be, shall be taken up for consideration—not merely that the rules provide that on certain days war claims or claims may be given the preference, but only on condition that no motion is made to consider a bill that is not a war claim or a claim. It is quite within the province of the Chair to hold that it is proper to permit such a motion.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I want to supplement what the gentleman from Illinois has said by suggesting to the Chair that there is a great distinction in meaning between a rule which says that certain business shall have preference and a rule which states that it is an order of the business of the day arbitrarily to consider certain business, and that no other business shall be considered. I think there is a difference between a preference and a determination. If the committee, acting under a rule that it give preference to certain business, having opportunity to decide whether it shall exercise the preference or not, determines that it prefers some other business to that which had the first right of way, it would leave the committee

utterly helpless if a motion to consider the business which was first presented to its attention could not be determined.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. If I understand the contention of the gentleman from Illinois correctly, it is that a motion would be in order to make some other bill in order for consideration, but the Chair announced that without motion the Clerk would report the first bill on the calendar, which is not from either of the preferential committees. If I understand the gentleman, he contends that it requires a motion to take a bill from some other committee?

Mr. MADDEN. I think the committee would have to express its desire to consider bills other than war claims or claims by a vote.

Mr. WALSH. The Chair can not tell the committee what it shall consider.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Upon taking the chair, there being no motion pending, the Chairman directed the Clerk to report the first bill on the calendar, which is a bill not reported by either the Committee on Claims or the Committee on War Claims. As the Chair understands the situation, to-day is the day under the rules when bills from the Committee on Claims have "preference," whatever that may mean. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] makes the point of order that a bill not reported from the Committee on Claims can not be considered to-day until all bills reported from the Committee on Claims have been considered, and cites from the Manual a ruling by Chairman Adair, made in the Sixty-third Congress. The gentleman from Michigan correctly cites from the Manual the briefing of that ruling made by the parliamentary clerk. Upon a thorough examination of the ruling the Chair finds that the briefing in the Manual does not accurately present the ruling made by Chairman Adair.

This question was first directly ruled upon, so far as the Chair is able to find, by Chairman Hamlin in the Sixty-second Congress. The question came up on a motion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] to take up, out of its order as it appeared on the calendar, a certain bill reported from the Committee on Claims. A point of order was made against it. After some discussion, Chairman Hamlin held that he would entertain the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina to consider the bill which was from the Committee on Claims out of its order on the calendar; that is, it was not the first bill on the calendar. This is all that Chairman Hamlin's ruling decided.

In the Sixty-third Congress this question again arose when the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Adair, was Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, but no point of order was, in fact, made, so far as the Record shows. There was a long, informal, illuminating discussion participated in by the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MANN, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GARRETT, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Hardwick, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. POU, and others. After a thorough and able discussion, Mr. Adair, the Chairman, overruled the point of order, although no point of order had been made. These are the only precedents in point that have been brought to the attention of the Chair.

In view of these precedents and the present parliamentary situation, no ruling that is now necessary for the Chair to make will overrule either of the rulings to which the Chair has just referred.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair permit an interruption? At the time of the Adair ruling the Record makes it very plain that it was considered by the Chair and by the gentlemen who took part in that debate, including the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], that the Adair ruling was in conflict with the Hamlin ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. It was so argued.

Mr. CRAMTON. Perhaps it is unnecessary, but I want particularly to direct the attention of the Chair to the section I cited from Hinds' Precedents, section 4713.

The CHAIRMAN. Being warned that he might have to rule upon this matter, the present occupant of the chair took occasion to look over the precedents and was unable to find any that were in direct conflict or that need be overruled by any ruling that the Chair thinks he must make at this time on the point of order now pending.

Paragraph 4 of Rule XXIII provides that—

In Committees of the Whole House business on their calendars may be taken up in regular order, or in such order as the committees may determine, unless the bill to be considered was determined by the House at the time of going into committee.

That rule, unless modified, would permit the committee to take up any bill on the Private Calendar. Paragraph 6 of

Rule XXIV, which has already been read by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], and of which the Chair will read only a part, provides:

On every Friday, except the second and fourth Fridays, the House shall give preference to the consideration of bills reported from the Committee on Claims and the Committee on War Claims, alternating between the two committees.

The gist of the whole question is the word "preference." What does it mean? Does it mean to give an exclusive right to consideration of certain bills on certain days; and if not, just what does it mean? The Chair feels constrained to attempt to construe together the two paragraphs of the rules just referred to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will permit, the point is not that the claims from the Committee on Claims are exclusively in order, but that they have preference over other bills and shall be considered before other bills are considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not believe that the word "preference" as used in this connection means that. In directing the Clerk to read the first bill on the calendar, the Chair took pains to say that "without motion" the first bill on the calendar would be reported. No motion was made. If any gentleman had made the motion that bills from the Claims Committee on the calendar be considered, the Chair would have entertained the motion.

Mr. CRAMTON. But, Mr. Chairman, immediately upon the statement of the Chair I reserved all my rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman still has his rights.

Mr. CRAMTON. And I am unable to find anywhere a requirement that a motion be made, but I shall be glad to make this motion if the Chair will recognize me for that purpose, although, if the Chair will permit, I would like to read this statement:

On January 25, 1901, the House was in Committee of the Whole House considering business on the Private Calendar under the rule making in order bills granting pensions and removing charges of desertion and political disabilities.

That is the other branch of the subject [reading]:

A question arising as to the consideration of a bill (H. R. 5931) for the relief of Henry L. McCalla, not strictly within the terms of the rule, Mr. Eugene F. Loud, of California, made the point of order that the Committee of the Whole House were operating under a mandatory rule of the House of Representatives, which the committee might not set aside. Therefore, the Chairman was not permitted to entertain a request that the bill be taken up.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the Chairman could not even recognize the gentleman to make a motion to take up a bill that did not have precedence, certainly any motion would not deny the right to those bills which had precedence.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair carefully considered the very case to which the gentleman from Michigan has referred, and has found nothing in that reference contrary to what the Chair has stated.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has heard the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized to make a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. No motion is in order until the ruling is made.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to reserve my rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has his rights and has had them reserved from the beginning. The Chair feels constrained to attempt to construe these two paragraphs of Rules XXIII and XXIV, so that they may both mean something, and therefore does not feel warranted in holding that the word "preference," mentioned in paragraph 6 of Rule XXIV, means that the Committee on Claims, by reason of having this "preference," must have every bill on the calendar reported from that committee considered before any other bill can be considered. The Committee on Claims would have the preference in making a preferential motion to consider bills reported from that committee and would continue to enjoy this preference provided that a majority of the committee did not vote otherwise.

Mr. CRAMTON. This is of some importance, if the Chair will permit. If it is in order for the Committee on Claims to have precedence it can not be then necessary to have a majority vote it. If it takes a majority vote to secure it, what benefit is the rule to the Committee on Claims?

The CHAIRMAN. The benefit of the right to a preferential motion to consider bills reported from that committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. Has the Chair ruled?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not been permitted by the gentleman from Michigan to rule.

Mr. GARD. Will the point of order lie that the Chair be permitted to finish his ruling?

Mr. WALSH. I was going to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Chair will

not feel constrained to rule that a motion to take up war-claims bills would be in order on to-day when the rules give the Committee on Claims' bills preference.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Committee on Claims did not claim preference or attempt to exercise its preferential rights then war-claims bills undoubtedly would be in order, in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But I hope the Chair will not rule on a day when the Committee on Claims have preference that on a motion in the committee the Chair would construe that bills from the War Claims Committee be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would not so rule. This is what the Chair would hold, that even though a motion had been made to take up some other bill and that motion were pending, if some gentleman arose and moved to take up a bill reported from the Committee on Claims or the bills on the calendar reported from that committee, the Chair would hold that to be a preferential motion and would put it to the committee. The Chair believes that this preference is all that is intended by this rule. To construe the rule to mean that no other bills can be considered on this day would result in this situation: That with two pension days on two Fridays of the month and claims and war claims alternating on the other Fridays of the month, there would never be an opportunity for bills coming from any other committee, like the Committee on Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, and other committees reporting private bills, to be considered at all. The present occupant of the chair does not believe that such a construction of the rule is required by the language of the rule or by any precedent or established practice. If such a precedent were established and followed, it would, in effect, take away from the committees of the House other than those given preference the opportunity to have their private bills considered. Such a result would be unfair, unwise, and not in accord with the spirit of the rules. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee of the Whole House now proceed to the consideration of bills reported from the Committee on Claims.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the Committee of the Whole House now proceed to consider bills reported from the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAWLEY. Are we considering bills to-day on the Private Calendar not objected to?

The CHAIRMAN. No; there has been no order of that kind made.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Is it in order to raise the question of consideration in the Committee of the Whole upon bills of this calendar?

The CHAIRMAN. That question has not arisen and the Chair will not cross the bridge until he gets to it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I move as a substitute for the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the committee proceed to consider the first bill on the calendar, S. 2867.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the motion made by "the gentleman from Michigan," under the ruling of the Chair, is a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains that point of order.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. May I ask a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair? I thought the Chair did not rule it was necessary to go to the consideration of claims, that that was a preferential order, unless another motion to another effect prevailed.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the basis of the Chair's ruling; but it is clear that the preference is intended to be given to the Committee on Claims to-day, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has made the preferential motion that bills from that committee be considered, and that motion is now in order.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then, the parliamentary status is this, that if this motion is voted down I may be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands it. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that he was in doubt.

Thereupon the committee divided; and there were—ayes 67, noes 70.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.



Mr. CRAMTON and Mr. GREENE of Vermont took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 110, noes 109.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote the tellers report that the ayes are 110, the noes 109. The Chair votes in the negative; the ayes are 110, the noes 110, the noes have it, and the motion is lost.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. The vote was announced and the Chair has no right to vote.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order—first, that it was not a tie vote; second, that the Chair did not pass through the tellers; and, third, that the Chair announced the vote and then, after consideration, gave his own vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not pass between the tellers, and the Chair did not announce the vote. [Cries of "Oh, yes!"]

Mr. CRAMTON. The Chair announced the vote. We still have rights here. The Chair did announce the vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the Chair announced the result of the vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is correct.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Chair announced the result of the vote by tellers, and did not declare whether the affirmative or negative had it. But I doubt whether the Chair is authorized to vote without passing between the tellers, except in case of a tie vote. The Chair in case of a tie vote, where he has not passed between the tellers, has the right to vote in the affirmative in order to carry a proposition. But in this case there was no tie vote. I do not recall whether there is any precedent on the subject, but barring a precedent, certainly it seems the Chair could have come down and passed between the tellers by calling somebody else to the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks, reasoning by analogy, that if the Chair can vote on a tie, he should be permitted to vote to make a tie, which would be equivalent to breaking a tie since it would change the result. But the Chair will examine the precedents, and, if wrong, will recall his vote. The present occupant of the chair wishes to rule and vote only in accordance with the rules of the House and the precedents. [After a pause.] The only precedent the Chair is able to find in the very brief time at his disposal is the following. It is very brief, and the Chair will read it in full:

5997. Hinds' Precedents. On February 18, 1904, the fortifications appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union when Mr. Choice B. Randell, of Texas, proposed an amendment and a vote thereon was ordered by tellers.

The tellers reported—ayes 79, noes 78.

Thereupon the Chairman announced that he voted in the negative; that the ayes were 79 and noes 79, and that the amendment was disagreed to.

This is all the precedent that the Chair finds. [Applause.] The Chair overrules the point of order. The Clerk will report the first bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee proceed to the consideration of the second bill on the calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move a substitute to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the committee proceed to consider the second bill on the calendar.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. To invite the attention of the Chair to the announcement he made in the ruling, that if this motion failed I might be recognized to make another motion to consider the first bill on the calendar.

Mr. CRAMTON. That was, provided it was a preferential motion.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. And the Chair recognized the other gentleman first. I relied on the statement of the Chair that I might move a substitute amendment.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair hear me just a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont to make a motion.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALDWELL. I thank the Chair very much for letting me state the point of order. The proposition is this: The gentleman asked the question in the ruling of the Chair whether or not he should be recognized for the Crowder bill if it was asked, and the Chair said yes; and immediately upon the Chair

reading the precedent and sustaining his own ruling the Chair, without waiting, though the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] rose to his feet, for anyone else to say anything, directed the Clerk to read the bill, so that the gentleman had not lost the floor. But the Chair was carrying out the promise to the House, and so I make the point of order the Clerk should read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can make no promise to the House except to carry out the rules of the House. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Vermont to make any motion proper under the parliamentary situation.

Mr. CALDWELL. The parliamentary situation is that the gentleman from Michigan has made a motion to take up the second bill on the calendar, and the Chair has recognized him?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMTON. I moved as a substitute that the committee proceed to the consideration of the second bill on the calendar.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that this would simply be a complication—an unnecessary complication—where the same result would be reached by a vote "no" on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is for the Chair to determine whether the House gets into a complicated position or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Chair held, as I understood, on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], to consider, first, bills from the Committee on Claims, which under the rules have preference; that it was not in order to substitute for that a motion to consider a bill from a committee other than the Committee on Claims. But the pending motion is to consider a bill from the Committee on War Claims, which does not have preference.

Now, it seems to me that where a motion is made to take a bill out of its order in the committee it is in order to amend that by substituting another bill. That is simply the motion of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], to let the House express its determination. And while the Chair intimated there were complications, yet until the consideration of a bill has commenced in the committee under the ruling of the Chairman it is not in order to move to take up any other bill on the calendar, and the complication would be, if Members are alive to their jobs—and it looks to me as though they were—they could make motions one after another to take up any bill on the calendar, and if they were voted down each time, then the entire day could be consumed on motions to take up a bill out of its regular order in determining the right to take up a bill by way of substitution. It seems to me—

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes; I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Under the gentleman's contention, it would be in order for me to take up the packer bill during the day?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, if the packer bill was where it belonged, on the Private Calendar, for the purpose of subserving the interests of certain private individuals, especially the interests of the gentleman from Texas—

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. And the packers—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It would be in order. But it is not on the Private Calendar. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair intimated that he would rule not to entertain a motion until the other was disposed of, on the analogy that when a motion is made to go into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of a certain bill you can not move as a substitute to consider another bill; and that was the precedent that the Chair had in mind in making the intimation. But the Chair is inclined to believe that he was wrong, and is willing to accept the motion of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE].

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I offer as a substitute, then, a motion that the committee proceed to take up the first bill on the calendar, known as the Crowder bill.

Mr. TINCHER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kansas rise?

Mr. TINCHER. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TINCHER. I want to ask the Chair to tell me, under the ruling of the Chair, what advantage any bill has by reason of the rule giving it the right to preference to-day? For instance, I have in mind the third bill on the calendar, which is a bill from the Committee on Claims. I wondered if it would not be in order to demand the consideration of that bill, it

having preference by reason of the rules of the House for to-day, and ask for the consideration of that bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would hold that that question having been put to the House to proceed to the consideration of bills from the Claims Committee, and the House having decided adversely to that, it would not have a privileged status.

Mr. TINCHER. That prompts another parliamentary inquiry: If the rule gives a certain bill a preference, does a tie vote defeat that preference?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Under the rulings of the Chair, the first bill on the calendar was reported to the House for consideration. "The gentleman from Michigan" then moved to take up, instead of that bill—that being the effect of the motion—to take up the second bill on the calendar. Now, the motion made by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] is not in the same position as would be a motion to substitute any other bill, because it is to substitute the very bill that was to be reported to the House, and which was to be substituted for by the motion of "the gentleman from Michigan."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is the gentleman accurate in saying that the consideration of the first bill was commenced?

Mr. CRAMTON. No. I stated this: "It was reported to the House for consideration."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No. I think the gentleman is again inaccurate. The gentleman from Michigan made his motion as soon as the Chair had ruled as to whether the first bill was in order. But the first bill—

Mr. CRAMTON. Whatever be the proper language, the idea I want to convey is this: That if the motion I have made is not adopted and should be voted down by the House, then under the rulings of the Chair, and in the absence of other action by the House, the House would proceed to the consideration of the first bill. And that is exactly what the gentleman seeks to accomplish by his substitute.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Suppose, however, the gentleman from Michigan, or myself, or any other member of the committee, moved to take up another bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have some views of my own, that this all might have been very nicely avoided by following the rules of the House.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I will not quarrel with the gentleman about that.

Mr. CRAMTON. We are not to blame for any complications that may arise. I stated that the motion by the gentleman from Vermont to substitute would simply bring before the House, if the substitute prevails, the very motion that would be brought before the House in the absence of any motion by me or by him, and that particular bill could not be substituted for the one that I have referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules that point of order.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the motion of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] that it is out of order because it contains no suggestion or attempt to suspend the rules, and I wish to be heard on that for a moment.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Kansas briefly on his point of order.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary to say very much. It is very obvious that the rules of this House provide that the claims bills shall have preference to-day.

That is the rule of the House, unless from the Committee on Rules, as has been suggested, another rule is adopted. That is still the rule, and the rules of the House can only be suspended by a two-thirds vote. The Chair has held, we will concede for the purposes of this argument rightly so, that he will entertain a motion to take up some other bill instead of a claims bill. That involves a suspension of the rules. The Chair can hear the motion, but in order to be in order it must contain the suggestion that the rules be suspended and that the committee take up something which will be considered in violation of the rules. While the Chair has held that he will entertain the motion, yet to have that in order it must say, "I move to suspend the rule"—that is, the rule which gives preference to

the claims bills. The gentleman from Vermont has not done that, and his motion is obviously out of order.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair hear me for a moment on that?

The CHAIRMAN. Very briefly.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think it is only necessary to say in response to what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] has said, that it is not in order to-day to move to suspend the rules, and no one heretofore in this procedure has attempted to do that. We have sought an interpretation of a rule—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not care to hear the gentleman further.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to another point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order which the gentleman has made. What is the gentleman's other point of order?

Mr. LITTLE. The Chair has overruled my point upon the theory that you can not move to suspend the rules to-day, and, therefore, I make the point of order that this motion is not in order under any circumstances to-day, because you can not suspend the rules to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TINCHER. I rise to make a preferential motion. I move that the committee consider the bill S. 1330, on the Private Calendar, reported by the Committee on Claims, as having preference on this day by virtue of the rules of the House over other bills that the motions concern.

The CHAIRMAN. The other motion is already pending.

Mr. TINCHER. I want to be heard on the proposition that my motion has a preference.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman very briefly.

Mr. TINCHER. And it ought not to take long, because the distinguished Chairman himself has ruled that the only thing which the rule of this House, which was cited by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], means is that the bills from the Committee on Claims have preference; that is, that the rule saying they have preference gives them a preferential standing if some one moves their consideration. There is a motion to consider war claims, and another one to substitute for that a bill from the Committee on Military Affairs. I have made a motion for the consideration of a bill reported by the Committee on Claims, which under the rules has preference to-day, and I think under the ruling of the Chair it would be preferential.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I submit that question has already been decided by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. That question was decided by the committee itself. The Chair overrules the motion.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. As I understand the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] he moved to consider a specific bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. WINGO. And the gentleman from Vermont offers as a substitute for that the consideration of another bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. WINGO. Why is it not in order to amend the substitute by specifying a bill that the gentleman from Kansas wants, giving its number? That would be in order; and I suggest to my friend from Kansas that if he wants to amend the substitute he may do so by substituting the number of the bill that he wants considered for the bill the gentleman from Vermont desires considered.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will hear me, I think the only analogy that the Chair can make is the rule of the House authorizing the House to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union after one hour is used up on what is called the ordinary call of committees. That rule, which is paragraph 5 of Rule XXIV, expressly provides that it shall be in order under those conditions to move to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider a particular bill—

to which motion one amendment only, designating another bill, may be made.

While that rule is not directed to the Committee of the Whole House, it is an analogous matter, and the Committee of the



Whole is guided by the rules relating to the House, so far as they are compatible with work in the Committee of the Whole. So it seems to me that one amendment substituting one other bill is in order, but that no further amendments could be made.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a further point of order, but pending that I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry as to whether the point of order ought to be made now or after the Chair determines the point of order now pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the motion of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] is not germane to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. The motion of the gentleman from Michigan proposes to consider a specific bill, not a series of bills. The Chair is familiar with the rule that where a motion is to consider or involves the consideration of a specific proposition, it is not in order to amend that by adding another proposition or by substituting another specific proposition.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I submit that these bills, all being on the Private Calendar, are all of one class, and an amendment is not the introduction of a new class of bills, but simply the amendment of a specific item in the class.

The CHAIRMAN. The substance of the pending question is not the merits of either bill. The point at issue is, Which bill shall be considered? The analogy in the rules cited by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes it clear that, following that analogy, the Chair should not now hold another amendment in order. The rule provides that where a motion is pending to go into Committee of the Whole on one bill, it is proper to move only one amendment to go into the committee on another bill, and the same rule will apply in Committee of the Whole House. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kansas rise?

Mr. LITTLE. I rise to move an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. There is already one amendment pending.

Mr. LITTLE. Then I move this as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has just stated that under the rules of the House, where one motion of this character is pending, only one amendment can be made to it, and such an amendment is now pending.

Mr. LITTLE. I move this as a substitute. I move to amend the motion of the gentleman from Vermont by inserting in lieu of the bill he mentions, S. 1637, an act for the relief of Albert B. Campbell, and I would like to be heard for five minutes on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not entertain that motion, and will hold that it is out of order, unless the gentleman can bring more conclusive argument than he has thus far.

Mr. LITTLE. A parliamentary inquiry. Why is it out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. For the reasons just stated by the Chair, and so much better stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] a few moments ago. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Vermont.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that he was in doubt.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. CRAMTON and Mr. GREENE of Vermont.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 134, noes 99.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Vermont is agreed to, and the question recurs on the adoption of the motion as amended.

Mr. CRAMTON. I desire to move to amend the motion as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule that that is not in order at this time, one amendment having been voted on.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; but does the Chair rule that, a proposition being pending before the committee, only one amendment of any nature can be offered to it? There can be only a certain number of amendments pending at one time, but the committee has before it now only one proposition, the motion made by the gentleman from Michigan as amended by the committee, and to that I desire to move a further amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in addition to what the Chair has in his mind, you can not amend the original mo-

tion, because that has been displaced. You can not amend the substitute, because that has been adopted.

Mr. CRAMTON. But, if the gentleman will yield, we have the original motion as amended by the committee but not yet adopted.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But the original motion has been eliminated.

Mr. CRAMTON. The original motion as amended.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The original motion has been eliminated, because the substitute has been agreed to. We are past the amending stage in any event.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the Chair prefers, I will move a substitute.

Mr. DYER. I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the gentleman's point of order and holds that his motion is not in order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman is evidently trying to defeat the wish of the committee to consider a certain bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. If you want to debate the bill, I am willing.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] that the committee do now rise.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CRAMTON. On that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. CRAMTON and Mr. GREENE of Vermont.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 75, noes 102.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee declines to rise, and the question is on agreeing to the amended motion of the gentleman from Michigan as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont.

The motion as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. I wish to raise the question of consideration, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has just decided by a vote to consider this particular bill, and the Chair therefore declines to entertain that motion. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I raise the point of no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote just taken disclosed the presence of a quorum. Evidently there is a quorum present. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill (S. 2867) to authorize the President, when Maj. Gen. Crowder retires, to place him on the retired list of the Army as a lieutenant general, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in view of the long and faithful services of Maj. Gen. Enoch H. Crowder, Judge Advocate General of the United States Army, and especially his conspicuous services as Provost Marshal General in conjunction with the various State and Territorial executives and the local and district boards, in the execution of the selective-service law, the President is hereby authorized, when that officer retires, to place him on the retired list of the Army as a lieutenant general, with the retired pay of that grade as fixed by section 24 of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870; and to grant him a commission in accordance with such advanced rank.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. To offer an amendment to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in order at this time. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, what is the time on this bill?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. One hour.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Vermont yield for that purpose?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Certainly; I am willing to yield if the gentleman wants to take more of the time of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont yields. The Chair will hear the question.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am glad that with the aid of the gentleman from Vermont I have recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is enforcing the rule.

Mr. CRAMTON. I desire to know what the time for debate is. The Chair has stated that the gentleman from Vermont is recognized for one hour. Then will some one opposed to the bill have an hour in opposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will attempt to enforce the rule. The gentleman from Vermont under the rules of the House is recognized for one hour.

Mr. CRAMTON. But I have asked a parliamentary inquiry as to what further debate will be permitted?

The CHAIRMAN. Unlimited, so far as the Chair is concerned, except that debate must be confined to the bill under consideration.

Mr. CALDWELL. And any Member having the floor can move the previous question.

Mr. CRAMTON. Not in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, and gentleman, I dare say that I speak your minds when I suggest that you are quite as well prepared to vote on this bill now as you may be at the end of an hour or more of attempts to debate or discuss its merits. I dare say that I am also within the limits of probabilities when I suggest that the several votes we have just had more or less indicate the temper of the committee now toward this particular measure. At the same time I feel, having been charged with the responsibility of reporting the bill from the Committee on Military Affairs, that I would not be true to that responsibility nor would I be true to the object and purposes of the bill if I did not briefly outline some of the reasons why the committee felt constrained, yes, felt moved by common impulse, to ask the House to give Maj. Gen. Enoch H. Crowder the distinction of being retired at the completion of his active service with the exalted rank and dignity of lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

I realize that following a great war, a great world cataclysm, in which the largest armies the United States ever employed in the field were engaged, and in which some of the most brilliant records were made by splendid American soldiers, this Congress is likely for some time to come to be beset on the right hand and on the left by requests to give recognition to the valor and gallantry and distinguished services of many of these leaders in the field. But I also realize, as doubtless you do, that unless we approach the task manifestly before us with something like deliberation, and with the idea that we will be judicial and judicious enough to avoid making our first step a dangerous precedent, we may help somewhat to solve the problem that lies before us in the near future.

It has been said that republics are ungrateful, and doubtless there is much in history to substantiate it.

It is worthy of notice that this particular war was not fought under conditions that prevailed throughout all ages past in war time where the combatants were more or less conspicuous in the open field, and where individual instances of gallantry and meritorious service, of distinguished leadership and great sacrifice stood out prominently on the canvas, so that the people throughout the country might personally recognize and identify these heroes.

War has changed its wrinkled front somewhat; it is just as murderous, just as barbarous, but now invokes the high intellectual powers of men to do these awful things by means and methods that do not bring the leaders as clearly in the light of publicity as great men who direct the awful carnage and death. So it seems reasonable that we ought to approach these questions of bestowing awards of honor to these soldiers of the war in a judicious and judicial manner lest we start with a precedent that may come to provoke us and plague us, and to defeat our better intentions through all the cases that may lie before us in the near future.

We know that it is the first common impulse of a man thinking about war heroes to think of the brilliant deeds of service rendered by great military men who led the troops on the battle field, and that impulse is natural enough, and of course is supported by brilliant instances in the long history of warfare. But, as I have just taken the liberty to remind you, the character of warfare has changed. Right in this very Hall a few years ago we all dwelt upon the peculiar characteristic changes in the manner of warfare and the fact that the Nation was in arms now, not alone the men on the battle field but every man, woman, and child who could render service to the country in her great hour of stress was invoked to perform that service, and that right from the start the patriotic devotion and service of our people, whether in the field, whether at the plow, whether in the factory or workshop, the duty devolved upon them equally—

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield? Is the gentleman thinking of presenting any reward to anybody who was working at the plow or the factory or in the shop?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think the gentleman's question answers itself. I can not think of an answer as absurd as the question.

Mr. LITTLE. And I can not think of anything so absurd as the proposition of taking this lawyer, who never was in a fight in his life, and making him lieutenant general.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I should prefer to make my effort for missionary work somewhere else than the floor of the House.

This is not a primary school. All men can not be on the battle field—

Mr. LITTLE. What battle field was this man ever on?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the only way to get an honorable reward is to be shot at, some man might get an old squirrel rifle and pull the trigger with his toe if he was sure that the aim was right. [Laughter.]

Mr. LITTLE. If this lawyer is to be made lieutenant general, why do not you make some of these farmers and nurses lieutenant generals? They are as much entitled to it as he.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Has the gentleman consumed all of my time that he desires?

Mr. LITTLE. No; I would like to have about 20 minutes of it, but the gentleman has not answered about the nurses yet.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I never saw a nurse who could not answer for herself. When I was interrupted I was about to suggest that there were important responsibilities—

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do.

Mr. JONES of Texas. In all seriousness does not the gentleman think it is unwise to select an individual who served this country and promote him in this fashion or give added distinction when it will necessarily exclude a great many who served on the field of battle and at the front?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I realize the gentleman's question is well founded in a very proper doubt, and I think we shall eventually be brought to exactly the same test of our judgment whether we dodge it now or not. There is unquestionably a reason to feel that men who have rendered unusual and peculiarly distinctive service when their country is in peril should have something more than a per diem when the proper time comes, when we are not in the first flush of enthusiasm over the thing and when we can approach it with more deliberation. Now, I realize, of course, there is no end to the amount of sacrifice in personal cases which were made in this country during that awful conflict, and yet as reasonable men, as men whose business it is to sit here and reason and deliberate apart from the influence of enthusiasm or even prejudice, I hope we realize that there are some institutional things in the Government that it is necessary sometimes to recognize by unusual distinctions because they are fundamental institutions and without them—

Mr. BANKHEAD rose.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the gentleman will permit me—there is really no certainty or security of government. Now, we can not recognize of itself such an impersonal thing as an institution. Humans as we are, we seek and we attempt to identify some person of the institution as best typifying the great work which that institution may have rendered during the crisis. It is entirely within that idea that we select a man who represents this institution, of a great governing force in the administration of this war along the line of the requirements of placing armies in the field and—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman now yield for a question?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This bill seeks to confer upon Gen. Crowder an honor for his distinguished services. I would like to ask the gentleman from Vermont why it is, in view of the fact that Maj. Gen. Hunter Liggett—who is soon to be retired from the Army on account of age and was commander of the American Army in France, and who, I think, the gentleman will admit made a most brilliant record as commander of that Army—is not included in this bill? I would like to ask the gentleman whether, if the bill is to be passed, if an amendment will be permitted to be offered including Gen. Hunter Liggett?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am afraid my good friend takes me somewhat at a disadvantage, because what I might say to him in my personal capacity in the presentation of legislation I would not feel authorized here in behalf of the committee I am now representing to guarantee on this floor, and therefore I want to suggest that from the gentleman's long experience in parliamentary usage and subtleties of parliamentary strategy he knows if we open this bill to amendment by adding the name of one man we might as well add the lineal list of the Army to it at once.

Mr. CALDWELL. If the gentleman will permit, I do not know whether the gentleman was present in the committee when the Liggett bill was up—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I was.

Mr. CALDWELL. A couple of days ago, and he might answer as to what took place.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not think I am privileged to reveal what took place in the way of deliberations of the committee just now.



Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Gladly.

Mr. RUCKER. In answer to the gentleman from Alabama, I understood the gentleman to say this bill is to honor Gen. Crowder.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. If it is passed he would never be a lieutenant general, active?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No, sir.

Mr. RUCKER. It would have effect after his retirement from the Army?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUCKER. Is it his purpose to retire as soon as the bill is passed?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I understand, not officially—I hope I avoid the risk of misquoting the gentleman—but I understand it is his hope to be able to retire under the law.

Mr. RUCKER. If the gentleman can not quote him accurately many other gentlemen can, because he has talked with them frequently. What amount of retired pay would this bill give Gen. Crowder?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. As I recall now, he would retire in his present grade of major general at \$6,000 a year, and if he is advanced to the grade of lieutenant general he will be given \$750 a year more.

Mr. RUCKER. \$750?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Pardon me, but I hope it is not necessary to suggest that it is not a monetary consideration that brings out this bill.

Mr. RUCKER. I believe I can show to the House it is.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Very well.

Mr. RUCKER. And I want to say to the gentleman who reported the bill that the gentleman has developed the fact that he does not know the bill, as I shall show the gentleman when I get the floor.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Well, I am very sorry.

Mr. RUCKER. I appreciate the fact possibly the gentleman is sorry, but I mean no discourtesy. I mean to say the gentleman's statement about the amount this bill carries is not correct.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I said that I believed and so understood. You must remember, and I am sure the gentleman does, that the grade of lieutenant general does not exist in our Army, and we have only the analogies of the several temporary instances in the past when it was permitted to exist for a while to go by when we make any computation for the present. There is no statutory law, I am now of opinion, that absolutely fixes, as it does the other permanent grades of the Army, what shall be the emoluments of a lieutenant general.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman state in general figures what it is, as he understands it?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I can not, because I have been informed that I do not understand it.

Mr. RUCKER. I thought the gentleman would give me the benefit of his understanding.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. And in that I am very sincere. I mean no disrespect to my ancient friend; no disrespect whatever. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield to another ancient friend?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I would like to ask if the gentleman from Vermont, or any other member of the Military Committee, will state to the House exactly the amount of money that would be given to Gen. Crowder if this rank was granted to him under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am obliged to say to my friend exactly what I did say to the other gentleman just a moment ago, that I have not myself prepared all the argument that is to be, I hope, brought forward on this floor. There is some data, circumstance, and detail that I do not know. I only know in a general way that the grade of lieutenant general, being only occasionally created by special act for a special purpose, is not a part of the tactical organization of the Army that has a prescribed statutory limitation to all the emoluments that are connected with it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Could it possibly be true that this great committee would bring in a bill before this House creating this rank, and then not be able to tell the House how many thousands or hundreds of dollars the general will receive when he gets this rank, it being recognized by all of us it is for more than lieutenant general?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. When I get through, if nobody else will say anything, his assumption may have an argumentative effect on this company. I am not taking such a position

and do not intend to. I have been chosen by the committee to open the door, and when I sit down the gentleman will probably be able to learn a great deal more than I will be able to tell him.

With the indulgence of the House for having occupied so much time, I merely wish to suggest this about the services of Gen. Crowder, and I will suggest again that the details will be dwelt upon by men who have prepared themselves to do it.

A great many people naturally question what may be the character and foundation of this service, and in the enthusiasm and excitement, the stimulus and the inspiration, of the Great War days, I dare say few people had occasion or took thought to inquire into the magnitude, the almost overwhelming magnitude, of the task that was put through by the Provost Marshal General of the United States. If you will permit me to get back just for this one little stepping-stone, I will say that years ago, when Enoch Crowder was graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point and assigned to duty as a second lieutenant of Cavalry, he was sent to a far-away post in the Southwest. Those were the old, old days of the old, old Army, a solitary, hermitlike life in a little one-troop or one-company post out in the desert somewhere, in a place that had been marked out on the frontier line in Indian warfare.

Enoch Crowder went down there a young second lieutenant, a "shave-tail," as the Army calls them, to this isolated Army post, where there was little or nothing of service; but they were simply more or less on guard, waiting an occasional alarm from the Indians or excitement from bad men, so called, or from cattle rustlers, or something like that. And yet even then, in the beginning of his military career, Enoch Crowder did not choose to be idle, did not choose to luxuriate in the ease and independence of his assured military station. He began to study. He was naturally a student of men and things, of history and the philosophy of history, and particularly, of course, of his speciality in military science.

He made up his mind in those days that if again a great war confronted this country that there could be no question that it must have as a foundation principle upon which its armies were raised and organized and put into the field what we have come now to know as the selective service. In other words, this Nation would have to abandon its ancient and sentimental idea of the volunteer soldiers fighting the battles of the country, and that military duty and the duty of defending this country, even to the point of death, must be distributed among men just exactly as any civic responsibility must be and is distributed under the law, all men according to their measure alike. So the young "shave-tail" in his hours of leisure through years set himself to read all he could find in libraries and in other ways about the manner and the custom that had been followed in the small, incidental draft that had been conducted in this country during the Civil War and then the policy and the status and the practice in European countries in their great military establishments where the service was compulsory.

He perfected himself through years of study of this question until he became an authority upon it, and yet few people probably have ever known it outside of those intimates who may have shared in personal conversations with him at times when his hobby was up for discussion. Nobody knew about it. But when the time came when this country was confronted with exactly that same situation that this young "shave tail" had studied out in the deserts of Arizona 25 or 30 years before, he was ready with a draft of the law that went onto the statute books of this country in that great hour of emergency, with some amendment, of course, meeting the opinions of people on the floor and in the committee room, and it became the foundation upon which all our great armies, involving millions of men, were raised and sent to Europe and which came home with a glorious victory. His was the foundation law. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Permit me to go on for just a moment, and then I will be happy to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That, of course, is simply the recital of a well-known fact. Possibly there is no argument in it, and yet facts themselves, if properly marshaled, are better arguments than rhetoric, and certainly a fact like that will stand all the assaults of mere rhetorical critics, because it is the basic fact in our military history during the World War.

Now, I am only going to ask you to consider the magnitude of the task of Gen. Crowder in this aspect alone. You are familiar from your own experience with what happened here in Washington at the time, with much of its vexatious and sometimes exasperating detail. But when you think that after

nearly 140 years of the old-time sentimental idea of serving our country in its armies by volunteering in time of war there was suddenly clapped down upon the people of this country the iron hand of the selective-service law, and that, too, without a popular referendum, and that, too, without any attempt to consult the hearthstones back home; and then when you consider that one man was called upon to be responsible for the administration of a law that was to go into every home in the land and search out every chimney corner and fireside and drag out every boy of physical condition and military age to go and make his fight for his country, no matter what he thought about it, no matter what the families thought about it, no matter about any other consideration except that one first elementary duty—you can easily imagine that the man who had that stupendous task imposed upon him did not have a very popular station in the United States of America during that time. We know that such a man, entering upon such a duty under such conditions, would have all the problems of evidence to meet in any case of misunderstanding, in any case of reluctance to perform the duty, in any case of misapprehension or complication of any kind, and all the evidence apparently would be by prejudice set against him and he would have to contend against all the adverse influences which you and I know came up from every section of this land, in some instances, to nullify that draft.

But it is nevertheless true, and I believe the gentlemen on this floor will respond to this sentiment as being true, that if there was one man who came through this great war test in high station in our Army and when the clouds had rolled away and when an opportunity for reflection and a perspective came to the American people, that man was held to have discharged a monumental task in true American fashion, it was Enoch H. Crowder. [Applause.]

Newspapers, pamphleteers, magazine men, people on platforms, and even the voices at the fireside in the homes, testified when it was all done that the man who was apparently equal to a task such as had never been laid before on a military administrator in this land was Enoch H. Crowder. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. How many young men are suffering unjust penalties in Army prisons to-day under the Army regulations that Gen. Crowder helped to maintain and perpetuate? [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not believe that that is altogether an argument against this bill. I am not a lawyer, but I think that there is a maxim of law that—

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. I would like to answer that question.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I will be happy if the gentleman will.

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. I want to state, in justice to Gen. Crowder, in reply to the question propounded to the gentleman from Vermont, that in September I had occasion to go before Gen. Crowder asking for the release of a young man in my county who was court-martialed on the charge of rape and larceny and sentenced to 20 years in prison, and who was at that time confined in the penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga. Gen. Crowder treated me with every courtesy, sent for the record, examined it, and stated to me that he found not a scintilla of evidence to sustain that charge; and within three weeks the young man was a free man. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Does the gentleman know that in October last year there were only 31 persons who were in Federal military prisons who were there at the close of the war?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I believe the gentleman has stated what the additional salary would be. What are the additional emoluments?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I have stated that as to that I am not fully informed. Those who will follow me will doubtless go into details as to that.

You gentlemen know in your own experience that it is true—it does not matter what we say here in debate sometimes for rhetorical flourish or for the purpose of carrying a point in argument—but the fact is that as to the man who is titularly the head of an enormous establishment, charged with the responsibility of carrying out the law, we all know that there are a great many facts of maladministration and details and instances of injustice which can not fairly and honestly be laid against that man's personal doorstep, where he can be made to shoulder the full responsibility. We could bring forward all

sorts of instances of maladministration of great tasks like this against a great many men which they would then learn about for the first time. We all know that.

I am grateful to you, gentlemen, for your consideration and indulgence while I have endeavored merely to open the door. I am afraid I have taken up more time than I intended, but it was caused by answering questions. Those who will follow me will give the details, and give them in a better way than I could. I hope that in our consideration we will be both judicious and judicial. Remember that "peace hath its victories no less renowned than war." Remember also that war itself must divide the honors between those who served gallantly on the battle field and those who at home, by executive administration of great responsibilities nobly discharged, make it possible to achieve victories on the field.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont had an hour. He reserves the balance of his time.

Mr. QUIN rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Vermont reserve the balance of his time?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAMTON. I ask recognition in my own right in opposition to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] is the ranking member.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is he opposed to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Mississippi opposed to the bill?

Mr. QUIN. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is the ranking member of the committee, and in fairness the Chair feels he ought to recognize the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman is not seeking recognition, as I understand.

Mr. QUIN. As I understand, there is no limit of debate agreed to?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No.

The CHAIRMAN. There is unlimited time. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] reserves the balance of his time. The gentleman from Mississippi has an hour, which he can yield, if he wishes to.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. To inquire as to the parliamentary status. Has time been yielded to anyone else?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] has been recognized for an hour. What disposition does the gentleman wish to make of his time?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some confusion in the minds of some Members about the debate, and in order to clarify it I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT. Has there been any limit placed upon general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. There has not.

Mr. GARRETT. Is it then true that whoever may obtain the floor is entitled to recognition under the rules for one hour?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands it, and the gentleman from Mississippi being the ranking member on the committee that reported the bill, and being himself opposed to the bill, is recognized by the Chair.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes of my time—

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman does not have to yield his time. Anyone can get recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can yield his time if he desires to do so.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, this committee is considering at this moment a measure that is presumed to honor some great hero of the late war. I voted on this floor and made a speech in favor of having the honor of general conferred upon Gen. Pershing. I believed that the American people owed that duty to the leader of our forces in this war.

I voted against making Rear Admiral Sims and Rear Admiral Benson admirals; and while I believe that every man who played a conspicuous and honorable part in this war is entitled to all the honor that is due him, I can not believe that the American people through the Congress of the United States owe the conferring by a private act of Congress of a special dignity upon each and all of the gentlemen who performed con-



spicuous services in this war while they were on duty as officers. My colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], gave you some reasons why Gen. Crowder should have this honor.

I have no grievance on earth against Gen. Crowder as a gentleman or as an officer. My service on the Committee on Military Affairs for eight years has brought me into some close contact with Gen. Crowder, and if the American people owed a duty to give every man who has done splendid service in the war some great honor, increased emoluments and office, there could be no legitimate excuse against conferring this honor upon Gen. Crowder. But since, according to my conception of the duty of our Government, it is incompatible with the institutions of this country to follow the forms and fashion of monarchy, I can not support the bill that has come to us from the Senate conferring upon Gen. Crowder the title of lieutenant general, with all of the emoluments and retired pay that go with it. Listen! This war sent across the seas corporals, sergeants, lieutenants, captains, majors, colonels, brigadier generals, major generals. It sent across the seas millions of red-blooded privates, who were on the battle field in Flanders, with gas and shells flying about them. Seventy thousand of them lost their lives. The hospitals in this country are now filled with the wounded. This Government owes a duty to the private soldier and to the officer who lost his vitality and his ability to earn a livelihood during the remainder of his life, and it will do well to carry out its full obligation to each and all of that type. Here in the city of Washington we had several distinguished generals who rendered able service during the war, and down here in The Adjutant General's Office was Gen. McCain, who rendered splendid service during the war. Is it proper that this Congress should confer upon him the honor and title and emoluments of a lieutenant general and retire him on the pay of that office? Is it proper to take all of the officers, from one end of this country to the other who did their duty, and retire them with such signal honors as this? This Congress, in failing to pass this measure, would not reflect upon Gen. Crowder. It would in no wise reflect upon the splendid service he rendered his country in time of war and in time of peace. Not for one minute would I do such a thing as that, and I would not stand idly by and see it done. But this bill is calling upon the American people to place Gen. Crowder upon a special pinnacle, to confer upon him a special honor and a special privilege over the other officers who rendered splendid service in this war. Do you believe it reflects the sentiments of the people throughout this Republic to confer such an honor upon each and all of these distinguished gentlemen? I can not believe and I do not believe that our country expects the American Congress to pass such legislation as this.

We came out of the war with great honor to our country. Did Gen. Crowder do any more to bring honor to this Nation than did other splendid soldiers wearing the title of general? My friend from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] speaks of the great Army being gathered by Gen. Crowder. It did not depend on Gen. Crowder to fight its battles across the seas. All of the American people are entitled to the honor of winning this war. These young men who were gathered together from the workshops, from the offices, from the stores, from the mines, from the factories, from the farms of the United States and placed in the camps and sent across the high seas—all the officers over them, from corporal up to general in command, are entitled to what glory there is, and also, my friends, the man with the hoe, who was bending his back working in the hot sun, in the rain, in the snow, and in the sleet in order to produce food to feed the soldiers and officers connected with the Army, is entitled to his share of the glory.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. Certainly.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I want to ask the gentleman in what instances he would be in favor of the Congress of the United States recognizing the services of its officers and generals, and if he is in favor of recognizing them in any instance?

Mr. QUIN. This Government has done its full duty in that regard when it recognized the head of the Army, Gen. Pershing.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Did the gentleman vote for that?

Mr. QUIN. I surely did, and if the gentleman had listened to my speech he would have known it and the reason why the Government of the United States owed it to the Army. It was an honor to the men, from the humble private clear up to the officers and all of those under him. It was not any special honor conferred upon Gen. Pershing; it was, as I conceive it, an honor to all the soldiers and all of the men composing the machinery of that great organization that conducted this war.

Certainly we could not go out and honor each and every distinctive individual soldier and every individual officer who performed splendid service by giving them distinctive honors and such emoluments as this bill does in this instance. So far as the emoluments are concerned, I presume that Gen. Crowder does not care anything about it.

Now, the American taxpayer is always the last man to be considered. I have no doubt they will put their eyes upon the American Congress and say, "Where do we come in?" I do not believe that the real hero, coming out of any war on the bloody battle fields, will ever have any contest on the floor of the House as to whether he shall be honored by conferring upon him the title for conspicuous service. Since the signing of the armistice in 1918, during all this time, has the American Congress honored anybody? At the proper time it rendered that honor to the American Army by giving Gen. Pershing great distinction in both branches of Congress, practically unanimous. Has our full duty been rendered to the men who fought these battles? You want to take an officer who sat in a swivel chair during the war, confer upon him conspicuous honor, when, according to my conception of its effect, this action would not extend to the privates and other officers of the Army. We might bring it where the private soldier of the United States engaged in that great struggle would have a conspicuous history and would be entitled to such honors as we are contemplating conferring upon this officer on this occasion. Gen. Pershing did not ask this Congress for any honor. The American soldiers have not asked this Congress to confer this title upon Gen. Crowder. The American private has not called on this Congress to pass this act. The American people, in my judgment, do not care for the time and money to be wasted in such legislation as this. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman controls the time for all who are opposed to the bill, and we are forced to come to the gentleman to get time. With the disposition shown here to steam-roller this bill through Congress some one may move the previous question and shut us out. While the gentleman controls the time, would it not be well to follow the customary procedure and allow the gentleman from Vermont to divide the time for speeches with the gentleman from Mississippi instead of taking the speeches all on one side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi controls 1 hour of the time, and as the matter now stands the gentleman from Vermont has half an hour remaining, and the gentleman from Mississippi has been recognized for an hour and has consumed 15 minutes, and has 45 minutes remaining in his control.

Mr. TINCER. Mr. Chairman, I have been out of the Chamber for a little while. Has there been any agreement as to time?

The CHAIRMAN. There has not.

Mr. TINCER. I want to oppose the bill, and I suppose I will have an opportunity sometime if I remain on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not promise the gentleman.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, is debate to be confined to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask whether it will be proper for me to suggest to the gentlemen opposing the bill that we go along in the usual way and consume the time that each of us control, and then we can come to some understanding as to whether there should be an extension of time.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman is aware and perhaps others are that I have shown some interest in this matter, that I have been doing my best to get recognition, to which I feel I am entitled, in order to explain my reasons for opposing the bill, but that up to this time I have not been recognized. Under the procedure here to-day it would appear that any time the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] can get recognition, he may move to rise and go into the House and shut off debate. We would like to feel that we are not going to be gagged.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, if he is shadow-boxing, that is all well and good, but I have not shown any sign of moving to rise, and shutting off debate, and I never heretofore have been accused of trying to gag anybody.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not know what the gentleman means by shadow-boxing, but I know what kind of a procedure is being had here to-day.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I want recognition in my own right. I want more than 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be constrained to recognize somebody in favor of the bill, when the Chair is informed what disposition the gentleman from Mississippi desires to make of his time.

Mr. RUCKER. I have no objection to that, if the Chair will recognize me afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Chair has an opportunity, in due course he will probably recognize the gentleman. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield or reserve his time?

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Vermont want to use any more of his time now?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I propose to use more, but I submit that it is the usual custom to keep the time very nearly balanced as between the two sides. The gentleman from Mississippi has three-quarters of an hour awaiting him, and I have only 30 minutes.

Mr. RUCKER. Then let me use my hour now.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I would further suggest to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] that he is much older and experienced on this floor than I, and he knows that if we begin to accumulate unused time on the part of everyone getting recognition of an hour, this thing will run off to a point where everybody will be disgusted.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to disgust anybody, but I want to talk, and I do not want to be limited to 15 minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think if we go ahead and exhaust these two hours which are now apportioned, one on either side, we will get along better, and then will be able to determine whether we want a limitation of time, and we can rise and go into the House and ask for it.

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman knows that he wants an hour now.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield the remainder of his time or does he reserve it?

Mr. QUIN. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Mississippi follow the usual precedent and use some more of his time now.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the discretion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would feel, inasmuch as the opposition has had one hour, that he ought to recognize somebody in favor of the bill.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Does the opposition intend to use any of its time?

Mr. RUCKER. I desire to use an hour.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Is there anyone else on that side who desires time?

The CHAIRMAN. If no one is seeking recognition in favor of the bill, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER. That is all right.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I ask to be recognized in the hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I understand that, but I had hoped the other side would pursue the usual courtesy in the circumstances, and nearly equalize the time. If the gentleman from Mississippi does not propose to do that, then I am put to my other alternative.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not determine that for anyone. If anyone wants the floor in favor of the bill, the Chair will recognize them.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, am I to be taken off the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not had the floor.

Mr. RUCKER. I have had it for 15 minutes, although the Chair may not know it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, since the armistice too much attention has been given by Congress and its investigating committees to the repeated efforts to take away the great credit due the Army of the United States for winning the greatest victory in the history of the world. The people of this country are tired of these attempts to belittle the work of our Army. The passage of this bill which is a suitable reward for the great service rendered by Gen. Enoch H. Crowder to our country, will

be most welcome news to our people who will rejoice that a man whose conspicuous services as Provost Marshal General in the execution of the selective service law has been recognized by the Congress of the United States.

We recognized the great services of Gen. Pershing and of our fighting forces in France when we created the office of general, but the war was not won solely by those of our Army who were fortunate to get in the battle line in France. In the passage of this bill we have now the chance where we can honor the great army of civilians who made up the organization and personnel of the selective service system. The selective service act authorized the President "to utilize the services of any or all departments and any or all officers or agents of the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia," requiring them "to perform such duty as the President shall order or direct." When this great act was being discussed in this House many predicted that the execution of the law would bring about a state of civil war in our country. Those of us who voted for the act knew that it was a new and untried scheme and that its success depended on the type of man who was put in charge of its execution. There can be no doubt now that Gen. Crowder, having prepared the law, was the one man in our country to undertake the task which was most intricate and difficult. Under the law a nation-wide machinery had to be set into motion. This system consisted of many parts and all had to coordinate and function regularly. There were (1) State executives, (2) district boards, (3) industrial advisers, (4) local boards, (5) Government appeal agents, (6) medical advisory boards, (7) legal advisory boards, (8) boards of instruction, and (9) civic cooperating associations.

These various boards and associations enabled practically every patriotic man and woman to render a service. Many who were physically disabled and unfit for service in our Army were given an opportunity to serve. Every home in our land responded, and the scheme of selection succeeded far beyond the predictions of its most enthusiastic supporters.

There were enrolled 24,000,000 men. We mobilized under it a selected army of more than 2,800,000. One million were mobilized within 90 days. The enormous group was classified in the order of its military and industrial importance. The war-time activities in the industrial world were speeded up and maintained to a maximum of efficiency.

In the report of the Provost Marshal is given a letter which well expresses the great work of this system:

Public opinion is kind and cruel, lenient and severe, just and unjust, but never corrupt. It passes sentence after hearing only one side of a case, but, nevertheless, in most cases it enforces its decree. It was public opinion that enforced the draft law. The local boards simply administered it.

The entire population volunteered. Congress merely designated the method of selection, local boards determined who should be exempted and the order in which the selected men should go, and public opinion attended to all cases of opposition to the law.

I have seen men who looked haunted because of the moral conflict raging within their breasts, between the duties they owed their country, their families, their business, or themselves. I know of cases where it took moral courage to enlist and others where it took more courage to stay out. I know of cases where men displayed a lack of courage when they joined the colors, and of others where they showed a lack of courage because they did not. But in this emergency public opinion condemned no man who donned the uniform. It concerned itself only with those who did not (p. 288).

When we pass this bill giving recognition to the services of so distinguished an officer as is Gen. Crowder we do credit to the Congress of the United States. To retire him as a lieutenant general is an act of justice.

The thousands who were rendering service through the many coordinating agencies of the selective system, many of them at great sacrifice, will recognize that the tribute paid Gen. Crowder is a tribute paid the entire personnel of this great organization which penetrated to every home in our land.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Do I understand the gentleman is recognized in his own right for one hour?

The CHAIRMAN. No one else claiming the floor the Chair recognized the gentleman.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. So that the time thus far allotted is one hour to myself, one hour to the gentleman from Mississippi, and one hour to the gentleman from Missouri?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would have recognized—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I have no objection to raise.

The CHAIRMAN. No one claimed the right to the floor.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I simply wanted it to be understood.



Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Of course, the Chair intends to recognize some one who agrees with the gentleman, so that the time allotted will be divided two hours to a side?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair intended to divide the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I wanted it clear that no one opposed to this bill was trying to get two hours to one of the gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlemen who are standing for this bill had exercised their right they could have saved all this parade, this filibuster here to-day of roll calls, and brought out of their pockets the rule which the Committee on Rules gave them two months ago, but they did not do that.

I realize that in arising on the floor to oppose the passage of this bill I subject myself to some embarrassment, and perhaps to some criticism. Gen. Crowder comes from the State from which I hail. He is one of the eminent men who adorn the pages of history of that grand old Commonwealth. Near by from where he came, Gen. Pershing also came; so Missouri gave to the United States for service in this last war two of its most distinguished men, Gen. Pershing and Gen. Crowder, and I realize that in opposing the passage of this bill I subject myself to some criticism, perhaps.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. I do.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. I want to suggest that Admiral Koons is also from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER. I have not attempted to name all the distinguished Missourians, for if I did I would name my colleagues on both sides of the House. The more I have studied this bill the further away from it I have gone, and I believe now, and I make the statement deliberately, there is not a Representative on this floor, be he from the North or South or East or West, who can vote for this bill if he follows the dictates of judgment. Why? Oh, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FISHER], with their wondrous eloquence and persuasive tones of voice, speak about the selective draft act. They say that Gen. Crowder is the author of that mighty, of that great bill. I am prepared to challenge the accuracy of the statement. I believe that a West Point graduate, a man by the name of Hugh S. Johnson, late a major of the United States Cavalry, an Oklahoma citizen [applause], wrote the draft bill, but, I admit, Gen. Crowder got credit for it. But it suits me just as well to accept the fact that Gen. Crowder is entitled to all the credit for that masterpiece of legislation, and if he is entitled to credit for the good the act contains, then answer me this, is he not responsible for the bad it contains also? If he wrote the good that is in it, did not he write the objectionable? I will show you gentlemen before I get through that from the beginning of the appearance of the war clouds over this great Republic, when the rumblings of war and discontent confronted our people, at the time when every home was in distress and when hearts were bleeding everywhere, when this grand Republic was trembling in the balance for its cherished institutions, I will convince this committee that even at that early period the man who wrote this selective draft act, the man who gets credit for it, wrote into that act language which convicts him of being the greatest profiteer in the United States. A man who will seek to coin the tears and the anguish of a hundred million patriotic people into money is the foulest of profiteers. Did he do it?

I will read you a line or two from the first draft of selective-service bill sent to the Committee on Military Affairs, and in it I will point you to some language which shows the beginning of an effort which has been continuous from that day to this. In the very first draft of the selective-draft bill that ever came from the War Department to the Committee on Military Affairs occurs this language:

Each bureau of the War Department shall during the existing emergency have the rank, pay, and allowances of a major general in the Army.

Now, if you say Gen. Crowder wrote that bill, then Gen. Crowder wrote that language, and for what purpose? To fill his pockets with money drawn from the pockets of the people by taxation.

The Committee on Military Affairs swept that language out of the bill, eliminated it, and did not report that proposition to the House. And I say that somebody was seeking to make money out of the war, and that somebody was one who, from his long life of service and great emoluments, was bound to respect that flag. But he did not secure the prize he sought through the draft bill. The committee would not report the language I have read, but, on the contrary, amended the bill by striking it out. The greed and cupidity of Gen. Crowder was

not satisfied; he was still persistent. Later on this House was considering an amendment to the war-risk insurance act. It was the amendment which all you gentlemen remember that made allotments, allowances to widows and children and other dependents, and provided for the compensation of soldiers—a bill that had as many supporters as there are Members in this House. No man was opposed to it. Everybody was its advocate and for its speedy passage. The only difference of opinion was as to whether some man did not have a proposition more liberal, more beneficial to the soldier boy who made such great sacrifices for his country, and we vied with each other to bring about the best bill, the most liberal bill. It passed the House, my recollection is, by unanimous vote.

In the Senate there were some amendments. I will call your attention to amendment No. 120, put on by the Senate. And in connection with the amendment, I will say right now that Congress was about to adjourn, had already adopted a resolution fixing the hour for adjournment at 2 o'clock the following day. At about 4 o'clock the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] brought in a conference report, which had been agreed to and signed by all the conferees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. For just a minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. The gentleman knows I have great respect for his ability and his opinion. I have just been told that under the original draft of the bill proposed by Gen. Crowder, the selective draft bill, that Regular Army officers would have had charge in every State instead of the civil authorities. Is that true?

Mr. FIELDS. That is true.

Mr. RUCKER. That is my understanding of it; certainly. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] can answer you, or the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] can.

Mr. QUIN. That is true; and the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Shallenberger, and one or two others, and myself, helped to get that change made.

Mr. RUCKER. Yes; under the magnificent work performed by Gen. Crowder, if performed by him, some Army officer of the Regular Army of the United States would have invaded every home and taken our boys, but under the wise and humane plan recommended by the Military Affairs Committee and adopted by this House the work was done by civilians, by their neighbors, by 16,000 or 18,000 people all over the country. And I challenge the gentleman who is responsible for this bill to name any one of the hundreds of the local draft boards which contributed so much to the administration of that law. He does not know one.

Mr. VAILE. Does the gentleman consider a United States Army officer as in the light of an alien enemy when this country is engaged in war?

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman need not ask me that question. But the gentleman knows that all over this country people are jealous as to the interference with their rights by Army officers.

Mr. VAILE. They ought to be jealous of the Army officers to protect their rights.

Mr. RUCKER. I have been diverted. I have digressed too far from the matter I was discussing.

These gentlemen brought in a conference report, and I will read what it says with reference to this Senate amendment No. 120:

Pay attention to this:

Amendment 120: Adds a new section to the bill, section No. 3, which provides for the revival of the term "general" in the United States Army and provides for the appointment of the commander of the United States forces now in France to this rank.

That is all we were advised about it. Everybody in the House was in favor of raising Gen. Pershing to the rank of full general, and the committee told us the Senate amendment did it. The rules were suspended by unanimous consent. The conference report was not printed in the RECORD. It was passed upon and adopted instantly, and then when we awoke to a realization of what happened we find that in addition to what the committee reported to the House, that Senate amendment 120 carried this additional language:

And hereafter the chief of any existing staff, department, or bureau, except as otherwise provided for the Chief of Staff, shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a major general in the Army.

By whom was that inspired? Who had been active all the time in this matter? Some gentleman spoke here awhile ago about seeing Gen. Crowder incidentally. You know as well as I know, that Gen. Crowder has visited this Capitol and the House Office Building oftener since this bill has been on the calendar than he has in 25 years, perhaps. Night after night he or some one for him has visited offices of Members of Congress, night after night and day after day he or some one for him has seen you and consulted you and tried to fix you. Some gentleman said that not long ago he went to Gen. Crowder and

sought to get a pardon for one of his constituents who was confined in the penitentiary on one of the Judge Advocate General's abominable 20-year sentences, and within three weeks that boy was at home. Oh, yes. I expect all of us could have gotten our boys out; we could have emptied the jails and penitentiaries if we had gone to Gen. Crowder before this bill came up for consideration. I am speaking plainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman does not mean to charge the Members of the House could or would or did go down to see Gen. Crowder under such circumstances as that? He does not mean to insinuate that?

Mr. RUCKER. No; and I did not say so. I said that he came here to see us or had some one come for him.

Mr. VAILE. The last remark does not sound any better to me than for the gentleman to say that Gen. Crowder was a domestic enemy.

Mr. RUCKER. I have great deference for the gentleman and want to please him, but I will not change one sentence in order to please him. What I said is true, or I believe it to be.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Does the gentleman mean to say that Gen. Crowder is a domestic enemy of this country?

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, no.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Is not that the statement the gentleman made a while ago?

Mr. RUCKER. I do not think I said so. I do not think any man wearing the national uniform is a domestic enemy; but I say he is not too loyal and patriotic to his country to try to get money from the Public Treasury through this bill, to which, in my judgment, he is not entitled.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman is simply calling attention to the fact that the general was very much in favor of increasing his salary \$3,000 a year, and always had that interest?

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. I will.

Mr. KEARNS. In what way would this bill increase Gen. Crowder's salary to the extent of \$3,000 a year? How would it do it?

Mr. RUCKER. Three thousand dollars a year is not a starting point, I will tell you.

Mr. KEARNS. How would it increase his salary \$3,000, if that is not a starting point at all? Tell us how.

Mr. RUCKER. I will come to it later on.

Mr. KEARNS. Why not do it now?

Mr. RUCKER. I am trying to pursue a certain line of argument, and that would not be in the order as I have planned it.

A few moments ago I referred to three gentlemen, members of a conference committee. I do not mean to impeach them or to attach any blame whatever to them. Those gentlemen, two of them on this side, are honorable men, and one on that side is an honored Member of the House. They were simply overreached by some one, and they will tell the House so, frankly. By the passage of that bill for the aid of soldiers we also passed a bill that raised Gen. Crowder to the rank of major general and gave him the emoluments of that office, which altogether, I am told, amount to \$8,000 or \$10,000—about \$10,000, \$8,000 salary and approximately \$2,000 emoluments. One would think that that was pay enough. But he was not satisfied, because that promotion and increase of pay was on October 5, 1917, in the closing hours of the session of Congress, and in the following May, when the Army appropriation bill was being considered by the Senate—not in the House, because the gentleman had already tried the House two or three times, and each time his avaricious ambitions had suffered disappointment, therefore he turned to the Senate, after the House passed the Army appropriation bill, carrying millions and billions of dollars for the support and protection of our boys who were fighting in foreign lands, who were being killed, and every breeze that wafted across the ocean bore to us the sad intelligence of the death of some of our boys—a bill he knew had to pass and was bound to pass promptly, Gen. Crowder got an amendment put on to the bill which says:

*Provided, That section 8 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, shall be held and construed to authorize the President in accordance with the provisions of said act "to appoint as lieutenant general the officer detailed by direction of the President to perform the duties of Provost Marshal General.*

Who was the officer? Gen. Crowder. That amendment was put into the Army appropriation bill in the Senate, but the House conferees struck it out and left it out. Then the war closed. There were no more bills that were so certain of passing

that an amendment of the kind he sought would not result in their defeat, and therefore he had to resort to a different plan.

Let me tell you: It is of strange significance that on the 22d of August, 1919, a bill was introduced here in this House, and on the same day a bill was introduced in the Senate, and by a strange coincidence both bills are identically alike; every punctuation mark and the capitalization and every word are just the same; one introduced by our colleague from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who does not appear to be present now, and one introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], both introduced simultaneously. Oh, they commenced bombarding the House and the Senate with a proposition to raise—a gentleman says to promote—Gen. Crowder.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman from Missouri want the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to be here? He has stepped out for a moment.

Mr. RUCKER. No; I will tell you confidentially I hope he will not come back this evening. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is generally here, you know.

Mr. RUCKER. Yes. I did not mean to cast any reflection on him. You had better invite him in. I am going to read from one of his speeches, a very eloquent speech, but directly the contrary to what the man says who introduced this bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I understand he is getting a little sustenance, and I will notify him.

Mr. RUCKER. This bill was introduced simultaneously in the House and the Senate. The Senate, with that knack that they have, soon got consideration of it one day when there were a few Senators there. It was passed in the Senate, but while on passage it was amended. Now, let me suggest right now that if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] actually drew the bill, or if the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has filled so well and with such distinction so many high places under this Government, actually drew the bill, he or they knew just as well on the 22d of August, 1919, as they ever have known since what the bill should contain to accomplish the end desired. I think there is some question as to who drew it. I think the same man that some people say wrote the draft act wrote the bill, because on its passage in the Senate Senator Knox caused it to be amended.

I asked a gentleman a while ago when he was on the floor how much money this bill would carry if passed, and, mark you, it will never do Gen. Crowder as a general of the Army one iota of good. If he serves 1 month or 10 months, he would serve as major general, even though this bill passes. It is only after he ceases service, after he quits the service of his country, after he turns his back, in effect, or, literally speaking, on the flag, that the bill becomes operative. After he retires from the Army the bill provides his name is to be placed on the retired list of lieutenant generals of the Army and paid every year thereafter as written in the bill.

Now, I ask the gentleman and I ask the other gentleman in charge of the bill if he is willing to interrupt me and tell me, and tell the committee, how much money will this bill carry if it is passed? As originally introduced it would carry three-fourths of \$8,000, or \$6,000 a year. But it was amended. As originally drawn the bill read:

To place him on the retired list as a lieutenant general of the Army, with the pay of that grade, and to grant him a commission.

And so forth.

That is the way it originally read.

As amended the bill provides that he shall be placed on the retired list of the Army as a lieutenant general with the retired pay of that grade "as fixed by section 24 of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870." Why that amendment? Oh, that brilliant Senator knew what he wanted to do on the 18th of August, 1919. But why this amendment? It is for the simple purpose of extracting from the Federal Treasury \$1,500 a year more than the bill would have granted otherwise.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman says if this bill is passed it will give Gen. Crowder \$1,500 a year more money?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. A while ago, in response to a question from the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], I understood he said it would give him \$3,000 more money, and I ask the gentleman to explain that.

Mr. RUCKER. If Gen. Crowder should retire now under his present rank he would receive \$6,000 a year during the remainder of his life. If this bill passes he will receive \$8,250.



Mr. KEARNS. How much more?

Mr. RUCKER. Two thousand two hundred and fifty dollars.

Mr. KEARNS. I understood the gentleman a moment ago—possibly I misunderstood him—to say he would receive \$1,500 more.

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, no; I did not. I say this: The bill carries \$1,500 a year more than the bill as originally introduced would carry, because as originally introduced he would have received retired pay based upon the current salary of a lieutenant general—\$9,000—but the bill as amended relates back to 1870 to an old, antiquated, repealed, annulled statute and ties himself onto that, because in that way he can claim \$1,500 more out of the Treasury.

Mr. KEARNS. How much does the gentleman say he will get if this bill passes?

Mr. RUCKER. This is from the Comptroller of the Treasury:

In compliance to your request, you are advised that if Senate bill 2807 is enacted as it is now written Gen. Crowder, after retirement, will be entitled to receive pay at the rate of three-fourths of \$11,000, or \$8,250 per year, being \$687.50 per month.

That answers the gentleman. But, mark you, in the same bill which authorized the appointment of Gen. Pershing to the rank of general it fixed the salary of general at \$10,000 a year and of lieutenant general at \$9,000 a year, and if this bill had passed unamended Gen. Crowder would have received three-fourths of \$9,000. But by amending it so as to receive the pay of that grade "as fixed by the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870," by going back 50 years into antiquity and picking up out of the rubbish some old law which has been repealed for many years the proponents of this bill seek to give him \$1,500 more than he would get if the bill were passed in its original form.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Do I understand that if this bill is passed in its present form Gen. Crowder, upon retiring, will receive a larger salary than Gen. Pershing will receive upon retiring?

Mr. RUCKER. That is my understanding of it exactly. Gen. Pershing's salary is fixed at \$10,000, and he gets three-fourths of that, while Gen. Crowder would receive three-fourths of the pay under an old, antiquated law that fixed the salary of lieutenant general at \$11,000.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. My information is that Gen. Pershing's present salary is \$13,500 for as long as he lives.

Mr. RUCKER. I have heard that.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I am advised of that by the War Department.

Mr. RUCKER. I heard that was done by special act of Congress, but I looked for it and could not find it.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. They tell me at the War Department that he is being paid that.

Mr. RUCKER. That may be so.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. And \$8,000 additional for allowances, making \$21,000, that Gen. Pershing would get on retirement.

Mr. RUCKER. That is no parallel. Now, gentlemen, if it was not dollars and cents that somebody was looking for, I ask, why this amendment? If Gen. Crowder had come into this Congress asking through his friends to be honored for the part he played in this war, if he had asked that the Congress grant him some distinction, I doubt if there would have been any opposition to it; but every time he comes to Congress he comes with his hand out asking for some honor which can only be represented in a check on the Treasury of the United States. Oh, it is easy enough to do it. We can vote him this, and it will not bankrupt the Nation. But before it is done I want to remind Congressmen that we passed a bill—I never thought there was any good faith in it at all, although many of our people voted for it—we passed a bill last summer granting bonuses to the ex-service men of our Nation. It is hung up in the Senate, and I understand its death sentence has been pronounced. We know that all over this land, once so happy and free from care, there are to-day roaming over the country one-armed and one-legged men who turned their backs on home and family and offered their lives under Pershing's command in France. We know that many of our boys sleep in foreign soil. We know that others are hopelessly bereft of reason, that the future is dark with despair to them. They are knocking at the doors of Congress, and we are getting letters in every mail, not demanding but pleading with us that we do common justice to them. And I want at this time to relate a little incident with regard to an afflicted soldier.

During the last session of Congress a certain major in the Army from Gen. Crowder's office visited me in my office and pleaded with me to cease opposition to this measure. On that

same day a scene was presented in the House Office Building which it seemed to me should arouse the sympathy of every man in this presence. A gentleman went in there to get lunch and found an employee of the majority—and I will call his name, because I honor him and know he is a splendid specimen of patriotic manhood—Mr. Pickering—you all know him. The gentleman went in and saw Mr. Pickering sitting at a table with a boy in uniform. He noticed Mr. Pickering was holding a glass of water to the soldier boy's lips. That attracted the attention of my informant, and he discovered that the soldier boy had neither hand. The incident was repeated to me and I sent for Mr. Pickering, and you can do that if you want to, for he is a brave, good man. I asked him the circumstances of his eating lunch with the soldier boy, and without my naming the particular district from which he came, Mr. Pickering said that he was going to lunch and saw the young soldier perambulating the hall, apparently looking for some one. He asked him if he could do something to help him. The boy said he was trying to find his Member from the State of New York, but he could not locate the office. Mr. Pickering said, "I will find it for you." He went to the Member's office, and when he got there the door was locked. Mr. Pickering said to him, "It is now lunch time and the Member is doubtless on the floor and his clerk has gone to lunch. You come and eat lunch with me, and when we come back we will likely find the secretary here." He said, "No; I can not eat lunch here; I must go out to Walter Reed Hospital and there get some of my comrades to feed me, for I have neither hand." Mr. Pickering said, "Come on, come with me; I am not ashamed to eat with and help feed a soldier who is bereft of his hands." [Applause.]

Then I said, "How did he lose his hands?" He said, "On the battle field. His gun was pointed at the enemy, when a shell came and cut off both hands with that one shell." Gentlemen, to-day that boy is getting the meager sum that we give him, but the titled officers, these men who are not crippled, are asking to run their arms down into the Treasury and get more pay for one month than this poor boy gets for a whole year.

Mr. PELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. PELL. Is it the idea of the gentleman that a general should not get more than a private?

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, by no means; but \$8,000 is more than \$2,000, is it not?

Mr. PELL. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. And a good deal more.

Mr. PELL. It is less per year of service that he has been in the Army in the United States than was voted to give every man in uniform.

Mr. RUCKER. I quote the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], in a burst of eloquence and patriotism, when he said if the Army officers are not satisfied with what they are getting, let them get out. He did not think of Gen. Crowder then. Gen. Crowder is the only one he wants to stay in, I expect.

Gentlemen, we have heard of Sergt. Alvin C. York, of Tennessee, a gallant officer, who, if the hearings before a committee of this House can be depended upon, was the one man who achieved a deed unexcelled by any man who wore a uniform of the American soldier. He captured 127 men, single-handed and alone, and among them three officers. A bill was introduced to promote that man to the rank of a lieutenant and retire him. That would give him about \$1,800 a year. That bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs long before this bill now under consideration reached the Senate, and there it slumbers the slumber that knows no waking in the archives of the Committee on Military Affairs. When will they report it? I remember the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] appeared before the committee and made an exhaustive speech in which he recounted the wonderful deeds of Sergt. York. That bill has not been reported. This bill came from the Senate one day and was reported with agility, activity, and speed by these gentlemen the following week.

Why do you not bring up the York bill. Why has not something been done for that soldier whose deeds we heard so graphically detailed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE] last week. Why, if you are going to reward service, do you not go back to Missouri, close to where Gen. Crowder hailed from, and find that young captain, Capt. Joe McQueen, who three times was wounded on the Argonne fields, who was finally dragged off for dead; whose company, consisting of 127 of the bravest boys of Missouri and Kansas, went into that battle, and when they came out of that awful fight there were only about 17 boys, all that were left of that gallant company. Why, if you are going to reward valor, do you not reward him? No, gentlemen, you turn your back on these boys of the Argonne

fields in favor of an officer who never left Washington, who never faced danger, and reward him out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. I can not now, for I have not the time. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. RUCKER. I shall be glad if the Chair will notify me when I have consumed five minutes more. Gentlemen, let me call your attention to a significant fact, and I think it is significant. There is not a soldier in this House who fought in the American Expeditionary Forces who favors the passage of this bill; not one.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. Is there one in this House who fought in the War of the Rebellion who favors it?

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, I think not.

Mr. TINCHER. Gen. SHERWOOD is going to retire from this Congress on the 4th of March.

Mr. RUCKER. At that time, the gentleman must remember, the officers fought. They do not fight now as they did then.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. Will the gentleman not admit that it was solely through the selective draft act that the world now knows of York of Tennessee?

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, no.

Mr. FISHER. Does the gentleman understand that he would not volunteer, and it was only through the selective draft act that he was brought into the Army?

Mr. RUCKER. With all due deference to the gentleman from Tennessee, you never can convince me that a man who has the American courage to capture 120 Germans, single-handed and alone, and with but one pistol, would not have gone to the rescue of his flag when that flag was in peril.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman must know that York would not volunteer? He had religious scruples against volunteering in the Army.

Mr. RUCKER. That may be, and that is one of the good things of the selective service act; but I am not in favor of paying Gen. Crowder \$2,250 a year always because he happened to discover York. [Laughter.]

Mr. TINCHER. Does the gentleman understand that the Military Affairs Committee offer as an excuse for not reporting the York bill and reporting the Crowder bill the argument offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FISHER]?

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, no; I do not think so.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman from Kansas should make a statement of that character.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, I could not suffer that to be taken out of my time. I want to say one word in conclusion, and I apologize for talking so hastily and so incoherently. When I think of all these cases, when I think of the fact that in the town that Gen. Crowder came from there lives the widow and two little orphan children of Maj. Stepp, who died across the sea, and that nothing has been done for his widow and orphans, but that we must now take Gen. Crowder up and not only honor him by giving him a high title, but honor him by perpetually paying money to him out of the Treasury of the United States, I am reminded of a little poem—

A blind man is a poor man, and blind the poor man is,  
For the former seeth nobody, and the latter nobody sees.

Gentlemen, turn from Gen. Crowder and all of the glory and glitter of high Army officers stationed in the city of Washington, and look through the battle fields for the heroes of the war, for those who came back wearing the crown of glory and of victory, and go search those mounds in France, and every one of them represents the burial place of an American patriot, a hero to whom we owe some duty. [Applause.]

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON].

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized as was the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Vermont withdraw his yielding?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON] for one hour.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with regret to efforts upon this floor to discredit the achievements of Gen. Crowder and to attempts to deprive him of the honors and awards which, because of the services which he has rendered, he so richly deserves. As a Member of this House who hails from his native State and who knows the many friends who admire him, I feel that I would be derelict in my duty should I fail to arise from my seat to say a word in his behalf, because however severe and unjust the attacks upon him he can not come here to defend himself against them.

In 1877 a tenant farmer in Grundy County, Mo., mortgaged his only team in order to enable his son, Enoch H. Crowder, to go to West Point. So limited were his resources that young Crowder traveled the entire distance in a day coach. By hard application and studious habits at West Point he laid the foundation for a long, active, and useful career. Immediately after he graduated he entered active service, and his record in the War Department is replete with a career of achievements so useful and diversified as to be seldom, if ever, equaled in that department. He has seen active service in the field. For 14 years he served as a Cavalry officer and distinguished himself in the Sioux and Apache Indian wars. But, in addition to being a soldier, he has been a student, and by patient and arduous work has equipped himself until he has been acclaimed the greatest military lawyer in the country. It was Gen. Crowder who worked out and set in operation the civil governments of Cuba and the Philippine Islands, and it was he as Provost Marshal General of the American Army, when this country was hurled unprepared into the European conflict, who formulated the plans and constructed the machinery which, under his direction, selected and marshaled the greatest army in the shortest time ever known in history. The recognition of his ability has been confined to no political party, nor has it been limited to the World War. On January 9, 1913, President Taft, in a letter to Secretary of War Stimson, after relating the long, brilliant governmental and international career of Gen. Crowder, said:

Whenever contingency arises in which it is necessary to have a man of great experience, a law administrator, and a lawgiver Gen. Crowder would be peculiarly fitted to satisfy the governmental need. I regard him as the best Judge Advocate General we have had in a long time. He is a real lawyer. His opinions are based upon his own judgment and do not respond merely to the wishes of the man who asks his opinion.

When we entered the World War and the herculean task of raising an army from an undrilled and unprepared people arose before us President Wilson, recognizing the training, experience, and ability of Gen. Crowder, appointed him provost marshal general. So well did he perform the duties assigned to him that on June 7, 1917, two days after the first registration, Secretary Baker, in a public letter addressed to Gen. Crowder, said:

You have done the biggest thing of its kind we have ever been called upon to try, and you have surrounded it with an atmosphere which not only created the success but made of it a stimulating demonstration of our national solidarity and patriotism.

A little more than a month later the Secretary of War, inspired by a sense of gratitude and justice, wrote a public letter to Gen. Crowder in official recognition and appreciation of his great work, in which he said:

When this letter reaches you the actual drawing of the numbers selecting the men for the first National Army of 500,000 men will have been completed and the third stage in your great task brought to a successful conclusion. First, you drafted the law for this great undertaking; second, you perfected with extraordinary accuracy the registration; and third, you worked out with infinite patience and zeal the arrangements for the great choice which affects the careers and lives of so many young men of our country.

It is not necessary for me to recount the embarrassment and difficulties which you have had to face; they would have discouraged, if not appalled, one having less devotion or less clear and serviceable knowledge.

Three months later, when an army of one-half million men had been mobilized, in a public address in New York, again Secretary Baker officially recognized the marvelous service of Gen. Crowder in the following language.

I have had an intimate, a most intimate, opportunity to observe the writing and working of the selective service law. I know better than anybody else who wrote it, who interpreted it, and who accomplished in the main its success. There are in the lives of all men moments which above all others are supreme, and this moment is justly entitled to be a supreme moment in the life of Gen. Crowder.

Thus it will be observed from the statements of Secretary Baker it was Gen. Crowder who wrote the draft law, that it was he who interpreted it, and that it was he in the main who accomplished its success. And in this connection it is well to remember that to him is due the credit of abandoning the draft system adopted during the Civil War of conducting the draft by the military forces and of substituting in its stead the democratic system of organizing draft boards of civilians who lived in the community where the work was to be done and who knew the families and the circumstances surrounding the men who were to be called to the colors of their country.



It is doubtful whether there was a man in this land who was so well equipped to judge of the worth of public and military service or whose heart yearned more for America's success than Theodore Roosevelt. On August 19, 1917, after the task of selecting the first division of our American Army was well on the way, Mr. Roosevelt said:

I regard Gen. Crowder's work with the draft as one of the best specific bits of work our Army has done in my time. I knew he would do it well, but I had no idea of how very well it would be. Of all our people in the first six months of the war he is the man who has actually accomplished most, the man to whom all good Americans should be most grateful. I respect—and I fear that I envy—the man who has earned the right to have this said of him.

Mr. Chairman, when I think of the marvelous services which Gen. Crowder rendered to his country in the hour of its great peril, of the patience and fortitude and endurance with which he took up a most difficult and unpopular assignment, and when I think of the brilliant success he made of it all, I am distressed when I find that the Member of this House who has the distinguished honor to represent in Congress that district, which gave Enoch Crowder to the country, should fail to appreciate the services which he has rendered. People of that district, boyhood friends of Gen. Crowder, have been to my office and pleaded with me to fight for him and do all within my power to counteract the hostile efforts of their Representative.

Mr. MILLIGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MILLIGAN. Was not Judge RUCKER the only Democrat in this House to be reelected from Missouri?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Inasmuch as the gentleman has raised that question, I call to the attention of the House the fact that although Judge RUCKER is the only Democrat in the present House to be reelected from Missouri, yet he had not made the speech that he made to-day when the last election occurred, a speech in which he charged Gen. Crowder with being a profiteer, and in which he reflected upon his honor, his courage, and his character. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] must have felt that Gen. Crowder had friends and admirers in the old district in which he was born, because prior to the primary two years ago, when the Trenton Weekly Republican and Tribune, a newspaper published in that district and in the county in which Gen. Crowder was born, published an article under the headline "Rucker opposes Crowder," and stated, in effect, that it had learned that Congressman RUCKER was disgruntled and was fighting a bill to promote Gen. Crowder, Mr. RUCKER wrote a letter to the editor of that paper, which was published at his request on July 25, 1918, about 10 days prior to the primary, in which Mr. RUCKER was a candidate. (I seem to have misplaced my copy.)

Mr. RUCKER. I will furnish a copy if the gentleman will tell all.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I have it here. It was published on the 25th of July, 1918. It reads in part as follows:

Mr. RUCKER. It is a very good letter.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I know it is; I agree with the gentleman. In that letter Mr. RUCKER says:

I desire to add that I have had many business transactions with Gen. Crowder and always found him competent and courteous. It has been my proud boast that among my many distinguished constituents was one man who is perhaps more prominent than any other American citizen in matters relating to the existing war, unless it is Gen. Pershing. I have a high and exalted estimate of Gen. Crowder and of his great achievement in connection with the enforcement of the selective-draft law. His distinguished services richly merit the recognition of a grateful people; and I as the Representative of that district from which he entered public life, would be gratified at any time to be able to cast a vote in recognition of his most distinguished and gallant services. I am not "disgruntled," have not been, and could not be with reference to Gen. Crowder or any matter pertaining to him. Our relations have always been pleasant and agreeable.

I trust you will give this space in your paper and that my friends who have written and wired me since your article appeared will accept this as an answer to their communications.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. Now, as the gentleman knows, I wrote my letter in response to a newspaper article attacking me for having opposed Gen. Crowder?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. And that letter was written before I knew anything about the things that I have talked about to-day, and I will say that I still honor him, but I will not take money out of the people's Treasury to pay him.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Many attacks have been made and much criticism offered regarding the court-martial proceedings during the late war, and it has been urged that inasmuch as Gen. Crowder was Judge Advocate General during that period, and that such proceedings were had in that department, he should be held personally responsible. I

have abundant confidence that any fair-minded man who is conversant with Gen. Crowder's record in dealing with military offenders and who is familiar with his activity during the late war will conclude that this criticism is unfair. In addition to being Judge Advocate General when war was declared he was appointed, as I have heretofore stated, Provost Marshal General of the Army, and with that appointment came responsibilities which required all of his time and which were of the first order of importance to the country, and the duties of the office of Judge Advocate General necessarily had to be performed by others. It was manifestly impossible for Gen. Crowder, while drafting and revising and putting into operation the laws for raising a vast army in a limited period of time, and while formulating the machinery and guiding its operation in registering the manhood of the country and in selecting therefrom with care an army of 3,000,000 men from the fields, the factories, the shops, and the mills, to examine court-martial proceedings.

Shortly after Gen. Crowder became Provost Marshal General Samuel T. Ansell, then a lieutenant colonel in the Regular Army, but who was subsequently advanced to the grade of brigadier general in the emergency forces, became Acting Judge Advocate General. In that capacity Gen. Ansell remained in immediate charge of the Judge Advocate General's office and immediately responsible for the performance of the Judge Advocate General's functions in respect of courts-martial until after the armistice, except for a brief period while he was in Europe, during which period Col. James J. Mayes was in immediate charge of the office. While serving as Acting Judge Advocate General Gen. Ansell undertook to constitute himself and the office over which he was presiding a court of last resort, asserting the power to review and reverse or modify the decisions in all court-martial proceedings resulting in convictions. When notice of that assertion of power reached the Secretary of War he brought the matter to the attention of Gen. Crowder as Judge Advocate General of the Army, who examined the law pertaining to his office and concluded that no such power had been conferred by Congress. He held that such appellate power as had been established had been conferred by Congress upon commanding officers authorized to convene courts-martial and upon the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army, and that appellate power should not be usurped by the office of the Judge Advocate General. His opinion was upheld by the Secretary of War and later by a committee of the American Bar Association, and generally by every reputable legal authority that has critically and impartially examined the question.

Though Gen. Crowder found himself compelled to hold, as a matter of law, that the Congress had not placed the power of appellate review in the hands of the Judge Advocate General, he was prompt in suggesting that Congress be requested to establish full appellate power; and he was likewise prompt, while awaiting the action of Congress, in devising as near an approach to the exercise of an appellate power as the law would permit. He drafted and submitted to the Secretary of War, for transmission to Congress, a proposed amendment to section 1199, Revised Statutes, designed to vest full appellate power in the broadest way in the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army, who would regularly act upon the advice of the Judge Advocate General as his constituted legal adviser. The proposed amendment was transmitted to the chairmen of the Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives by the Secretary of War, and was introduced in both Houses—S. 3692 and H. R. 9164, Sixty-fifth Congress—but, due, no doubt, to the great volume of business requiring the attention of Congress at that time, the proposed amendment never reached the floor of either House. Practically coincident with his action looking to new legislation upon the subject, Gen. Crowder transmitted to the Secretary of War a draft of an order designed to establish, pending the action of Congress, a system of review of records of trial by general court-martial. The plan thus proposed was promulgated as General Order No. 7, War Department, January 17, 1918. In carrying out the plan established by that order a board of review was constituted in the office of the Judge Advocate General, and a branch office with similar functions was established in France; and from that date every record of trial by general court-martial involving serious punishment was, in fact, required to be reviewed in the Judge Advocate General's office or in the office of the Acting Judge Advocate General for the American Expeditionary Forces in Europe, with the same care with which a court of last resort of a State reviews a record of trial by an inferior court; and though technically the Judge Advocate General's office and the branch office were without judicial power to reverse or set aside an illegal sentence, nevertheless substantially the same result was obtained as if the power had

existed, for the record in each case involving serious punishment was reviewed as to its legal sufficiency before any order respecting the execution of the sentence could be issued. Statistics show that only in the rarest cases did a convening authority ever fail to act upon the recommendations of the Judge Advocate General's office respecting the legal sufficiency of a record of trial.

On June 4, 1920, the President approved an act reorganizing the Army, and including, as Chapter II of the act, a code to be known as the Articles of War, which had previously been approved, after long study and extensive hearings by the Military Committees of both Houses of Congress, and which contained a revision of the law pertaining to court-martial proceedings. In that code it was written so plainly that he who reads can not fail to understand that the power of reviewing and reversing or modifying judgments in court-martial proceedings is vested in the President of the United States, and not in the office of the Judge Advocate General—except in those cases where the board of review, which the law establishes, and the Judge Advocate General are in concurrence as to what should be done; that is, those perfectly plain cases in which, because there is really no question as to how they should be disposed of, Congress did not think it necessary to burden the President personally with them—thus confirming the views of Gen. Crowder as to the intention of Congress as to where such appellate power should be vested.

Let us examine Gen. Crowder's record in dealing with military prisoners and determine by his actions whether his conduct has been harsh or inhuman. In 1911 he was appointed Judge Advocate General of the Army. At that time the Government had three military prisons—one at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., one on the Atlantic coast on Governors Island, and one on the Pacific coast on Alcatraz Island, in San Francisco Bay. In those prisons were confined not only general prisoners convicted of purely military offenses or of misdemeanors, but also many who had committed grave crimes against the ordinary laws of the land. All were treated substantially alike; that is, those who had committed offenses no more serious than an infraction of Army discipline were dealt with in the same manner as those who had committed grave crimes. The men who had not been guilty of offenses involving moral turpitude were held in intimate association with those who had committed such offenses.

Feeling that these prisoners should be segregated, Gen. Crowder formulated a plan which was indorsed by the War Department, made effective by general orders in 1913, and finally adopted by Congress in 1915, to segregate prisoners guilty of purely military offenses or of misdemeanors from those who were guilty of grave crimes and who were criminals at heart. Pursuant to Gen. Crowder's plan and recommendations, Congress converted the three military prisons above referred to into disciplinary barracks, in which the lesser offenders whose acts involved no moral turpitude were given an opportunity to reform. The prison clothes which had theretofore been worn and which carried numbers on their backs were removed from such prisoners as availed themselves of the new conditions and earned the opportunity thus afforded them. As soon after arrival in the institution as their conduct and prior record warranted, they were placed in uniforms and equipped with rifles without firing pins. During a portion of each day they were drilled in military exercises and during the remainder of each day they were given an opportunity to learn trades. They were surrounded by environments which encouraged them to become respected and law-abiding citizens. If their conduct justified, they were permitted again to join the colors and earn an honorable discharge, and to those who feared to again hazard the test of Army discipline was given aid in seeking civil employment. So that instead of military prisoners who had been guilty of offenses involving no moral turpitude being subjected to association with offenders guilty of grave crimes and being dealt with in the same manner and finally turned out into the world as ex-convicts, they were given a helping hand by Gen. Crowder, and thereby many of them were again honorably restored to the colors or returned to civil life as useful citizens. The system of dealing with military prisoners thus evolved was firmly established by congressional enactment in 1915 and is still in effect. Under the operation of the reformatory system thus established in disciplinary barracks upon Gen. Crowder's recommendations, more than 4,000 men originally sentenced to dishonorable discharge and confinement have since 1913 been restored to the colors and thus afforded an opportunity to earn an honorable discharge before finally leaving the Army. In this connection and as one illustrative example of the result of Gen. Crowder's efforts, it may not be out of place to cite the case of an enlisted man sentenced to

two years for desertion. He arrived at a disciplinary barracks in March of 1916, acknowledged the error of his former conduct, earned assignment to the disciplinary battalion, was restored to duty within nine months, and assigned to the Sixty-fourth Infantry. He became, successively, corporal, battalion sergeant major, and regimental sergeant major; landed in France early in 1918, and, being anxious to get into the fighting, began again at his own request at the bottom as a private in another organization; was promoted to sergeant, fought at Chateau-Thierry, was sent to an officers' training camp, and was commissioned a second lieutenant in October of 1918, was promoted to first lieutenant before the end of that month, and on armistice day was in command of his company, Company L, One hundred and thirty-eighth Infantry.

Shortly after the close of active hostilities, within three months after the armistice had been signed, and almost immediately after his return to duty in the Judge Advocate General's Office—that is, in February, 1919—Gen. Crowder established in his office certain clemency and restoration agencies to examine the record of trial of every military prisoner then in confinement in a disciplinary barracks or a penitentiary pursuant to the sentence of a general court-martial, and to recommend to the President, in each case, such clemency as might appear to be just and reasonable. As rapidly as possible—and by far the greatest portion of the task was accomplished within six months—the records of 9,545 military prisoners whose average term of confinement as originally adjudged was five years and eight months, were examined, with the result that pursuant to recommendations based upon those examinations, the entire unexecuted portion of the sentence to confinement in more than 3,000 cases was remitted, and the average term of the prisoners remaining in confinement was reduced to 1 year and 10 months.

But the establishment and operation of clemency and restoration agencies does not constitute the sole contribution made by Gen. Crowder to assure that no man convicted by a court-martial should be required to undergo excessive punishment. Almost immediately after his return to duty as Judge Advocate General following the armistice and practically coincident with the establishment of the clemency agencies above referred to, Gen. Crowder took effective measures to prevent the imposition of sentences that might be regarded as unduly severe. Upon his recommendation the Secretary of War, on January 22, 1919, caused instructions to be sent to every officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction impressing upon each such officer the manifest propriety of observing in general the limits of punishment fixed by the Executive order of 1916; although up to that time Congress had not conferred upon the President, or any other central authority, the power to limit maximum punishments in time of war. And on March 10, 1919, in a letter addressed to the Secretary of War, Gen. Crowder went on record in favor of—and recommended—a legislative modification of the Articles of War which would invest the President in time of war, as well as in time of peace, with the power to fix limits of punishment by Executive order. That recommendation has since been embodied in the new Articles of War enacted by Congress in June 4, 1920.

It is interesting to note that while on April 1, 1917, before the World War began, and when the Army comprised only 100,000 men, the military prisoners confined in disciplinary barracks and penal institutions numbered 2,300. Yet on October 31, 1920, after the World War had been fought and while the Army still consisted of over 200,000 officers and men, and after an Army of 4,000,000 men had been called to the colors and had served and had been discharged, but after the President had acted upon reports made by the clemency and restoration agencies established by Gen. Crowder, the military prisoners of the country in such barracks and institutions numbered only 2,500, or only 200 more than before the war began. In the face of this record, who would dare to charge that there has been anything in the conduct or official action of Gen. Crowder in his dealings with military prisoners which is subject to criticism or reproach?

By an act of this Congress the office of general in the Army of the United States was revived for Gen. Pershing, and his appointment thereto has been confirmed. By that act Gen. Pershing is allowed to retire with full pay and allowances for quarters, heat, and light. He is now receiving a salary of \$13,500 per annum, with an allowance for quarters, heat, and light amounting to \$8,000 per year, making his total annual pay \$21,500 as long as he lives.

Gen. Crowder now receives \$9,500 per annum for salary and allowance for quarters. If this bill becomes a law, he will receive, after his retirement, \$8,250, with no allowance for quarters.



Mr. TINCHER. That is, after he retires?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes; after he retires he will receive this salary with no allowance for quarters. Nearly all the Members of this House voted to make Gen. Pershing a general for life with the salary of \$13,500 per year and with an allowance for heating and quarters, after his retirement, which amounts, in addition, to \$8,000 per year. When we remember the honors which have been conferred upon Gen. Pershing, the privilege which was given to him to lead our armies overseas and to lead the triumphal marches in this country after the Army returned, and when we remember the difficult and painful task which we gave to Gen. Crowder of raising the army which Gen. Pershing led and which made victory possible, do we begrudge to Gen. Crowder the \$8,250 per year for the little time he has left after his retirement? If after casting a vote to confer that honor upon Gen. Pershing I should vote against this bill providing for Gen. Crowder, I would be ashamed of myself. [Applause.] I believe in being just and fair and equitable, and I do not believe that any man can give a fair, just, or equitable excuse for voting against this bill after doing what this Congress has done for Gen. Pershing.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I will.

Mr. RUCKER. If the gentleman votes to pass this bill the same argument will be made with reference to another one that will take in the whole line of officers.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I will say, in answer to the question, there is not any other man in the military service of these United States in the last century who stands in the same class with the peculiarly effective service rendered by Gen. Crowder.

Mr. RUCKER. Some stand in a better class, having led victorious armies on the battle field.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. The proposal in this bill to promote Gen. Crowder, when he retires, from the rank of major general to the rank of lieutenant general, in order that when he retires he may receive that honor and be allowed to retire with the retired pay of an officer of that rank, is not new in our history. Congress conferred that honor upon Gen. Nelson A. Miles, commanding general of the Army during the Spanish-American War. They also conferred that honor upon Gen. S. B. M. Young, who commanded a brigade in Cuba and the Philippine Islands during the Spanish-American War. That honor was also conferred upon Gen. Adna R. Chaffee, brigade commander during the Spanish-American War. It was also conferred upon Gen. Arthur MacArthur, who served during the Spanish-American War and was afterwards Governor General of the Philippine Islands. It was also conferred upon Gen. Henry C. Corbin, Adjutant General of the Army. It was also conferred upon Gen. John C. Bates, commander of a brigade during the Spanish-American War.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Were all these gentlemen retired with the rank of lieutenant general?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Exactly. Many of these officers are still alive and drawing their retired pay.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Were they retired under the act of 1870, which gives them \$1,500 extra?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. This bill does not give Gen. Crowder \$1,500 extra. This bill provides only \$8,250.

I am told by those who have examined the bill and studied it carefully that this bill will result in his receiving, after he retires, \$8,250 per year as long as he lives, without any allowance.

Mr. RUCKER. That is true; but does not the current law or the act of 1916 fix the salary of a lieutenant general at \$9,000?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I know it was the purpose of framers of this bill—and I think there is no doubt about them having accomplished their purpose—to have Gen. Crowder receive \$8,250.

It has been contended that Gen. Crowder's service did not require him to go to the front. But Gen. Crowder was not responsible for his failure to get to the front. After he had constructed the draft machinery and had set it in operation, and after he had inducted the earlier drafts, he went to the Secretary of War in person and pleaded to be permitted to organize a division and to go with it to France; but he was advised that his services in raising the Army, and his ability to handle that department, were so important to the country that he could not be spared to take the command of soldiers and go to the battle front.

As the result of the last war there stand out in America two great military figures. One is Gen. Pershing and the other is Gen. Crowder. To Gen. Pershing was given the honor—the

envy of every soldier—of commanding our armies at the front. His was a service which caught the imagination of the masses, and kindled the enthusiasm of the Nation. The eyes of the world were upon him, because he was at the scene of the conflict. When the war had been won and the enemy vanquished, he returned, a conquering hero. His path was strewn with flowers, while he rightly received the plaudits of a grateful people. And the Congress justly rewarded him by creating for him the office of General of the Armies of the United States, to which he has been appointed and confirmed. To Gen. Crowder was assigned the painful, difficult duty of going to the mountains, prairies, and valleys of the country and calling from the homes and firesides of the people the boys who were to make up the Army which Gen. Pershing had the signal honor to command. This service did not appeal to the popular fancy. But it was a service fully as necessary and difficult as any service rendered in France; for without the draft an adequate army could not have been raised; and without an army Gen. Pershing could not have achieved success. Yet, difficult as the service was, Gen. Crowder performed it with boundless success. He constructed the machinery and set it in operation, which without friction or discord registered 24,000,000 men. From that number he called to the colors 3,000,000 men, while a million more volunteered in the Regular Army and the National Guard without waiting for the draft. Four million men were mobilized and drilled, and more than 2,000,000 of them were landed in France in a time so short as to amaze the civilized world. In performing his task Gen. Crowder expended only \$30,000,000 out of a much larger appropriation, and the charge has never been made that graft ever existed in his department or that one dollar of that vast sum of money was ever misappropriated. Great men of this Nation have acclaimed his work as one of the marvels of the conflict, and yet there are those among us who begrudge to Gen. Crowder the recognition a lieutenant generalcy would imply.

Now, gentlemen, I do not care to take more of your time. I think that when you have examined the facts in this case, when you have studied the justice involved in this bill, you will come to the conclusion that this Congress, as a matter of gratitude and justice, can do no less than to give to Gen. Crowder this honor, because by his services he has so richly deserved it. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton].

The CHAIRMAN. How much time?

Mr. QUIN. Thirteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton] is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, in every debate in this House that extends for any length of time and that is contested with any feeling whatever, a number of side issues necessarily are brought in, and this debate is no exception. For my own part I would like to emphasize that I am glad to concur in much which has been said in behalf of this measure by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON]. I am very glad to be able to agree with them, as I think all of us are, that America played a wonderful, glorious part in the Great War. I think we are willing to concede that Gen. Crowder, at the post of duty that was given to him, performed his duties to the best of his ability, with credit to himself and his country. But I contend that we may agree to all that and still feel that this is not the time to give him the preferred recognition proposed, and that if we are to give him preferred recognition at this time the bill reported is not the proper expression of that desire.

Gen. Crowder was not the only man who performed his duty to the best of his ability and with credit to himself and his country.

Both great political parties in their platforms adopted less than a year ago pledged themselves to give recognition to certain individuals who performed their duty in that crisis. I have looked in vain to see anything in the political platforms concerning the meritorious services of Gen. Crowder or of other generals who worked here in the department, but I do find in the Republican platform the pledge that the Federal Government should treat with the utmost consideration every disabled soldier, and the Democratic platform contains a like pledge. Still every Member of this House knows that there are in committee to-day and that there are upon the calendar measures to give proper care to the disabled soldiers, and the time remaining in this session does not permit their consideration by the Congress. Those disabled soldiers can not get the justice that the platforms of both parties and the demands of the country insist they shall have, but we can take a day here to give preference to Gen. Crowder.

Further, a bill passed the House in the last session to give expression of the appreciation of the people of the United States to the services of the men in khaki through the adjusted compensation law. I stood here at this center aisle to-day as several votes were taken by the tellers with reference to this measure, and there came between the tellers the members of this committee, and I say to you the thing that impressed me most, remembering the fight we had here to get adjusted compensation for those men who made the real sacrifices that the country wants freely to recognize—I remember that I found coming through between the tellers man after man and score after score of those who voted against adjusted compensation for the private soldier, trooping through to vote for this preferential proposition for Gen. Crowder.

But I do not want to tear down any credit due Gen. Crowder, neither do I want him preferred above every private soldier, and above every officer who served with distinction on this side or on that side in the war. [Applause.]

But they say, "We recognized Gen. Pershing, and so we must recognize Gen. Crowder," linking those two names as the great military chieftains of America in a century. Let that stand for itself. We recognized Gen. Pershing in part for his own services, but in part we gave that recognition to the great commander in chief of our forces in the field, as a recognition to the armies themselves. But when in this bill you recognize Gen. Crowder, it is Gen. Crowder alone. But they say that it was a greater responsibility to sit at a desk in Washington and draft legislation and handle the selective-service measure than to command troops in the field.

I remember in July, 1918, I sat on a field near the River Oureq, where a week before the soldiers of Michigan and of Wisconsin had won imperishable fame as they pressed back the German troops—back, back, kilometer after kilometer, to Fismes. I sat beside an old schoolmate of mine, a major in the service with the National Guard, who had under his command in that fierce fighting boys from his own neighborhood in Grand Rapids. My old friend was still shaken from his experience and his responsibility. It had not been his privilege to sign his name to orders—to appear before committees of Congress. It had been his duty on the field of battle to say to this bunch of boys that he had known from babyhood, whose parents he knew, "You make that attempt," when he knew that it was death to those whom he selected. Can anyone believe there is any comparison between the responsibilities that lie upon the shoulders of a general behind a desk at Washington as compared with the responsibilities of any commanding officer on the battle field? I say we have no business here to make this preference for Gen. Crowder. And let me say to you, one and all, that if this Congress adjourns on the 4th of March having given this preference to one desk general and denied proper recognition of their claims to the soldiers disabled during the war, and to the men in khaki who made the sacrifices, you will hear from it every time you meet a man in khaki in your home districts.

Well, time passes. I say not only that we ought not to make the preference proposed here; but if we were going to give Gen. Crowder preference, this is not the proper kind of a measure. I think there is not a squarer man in the House than my friend from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], nor is there any in whom I have more confidence, both in his honesty and his ability and his knowledge of military matters. Still, when he was before this committee he was asked why they went back to the law of 1870, and what the effect would be on Gen. Crowder, and he was not able to give the committee the information.

I have before me the bill that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] introduced. It is identical with the Senate bill now before you, except that the Senate bill harks back to the law of 1870. Now, what is the difference? I have here an Army pay table compiled by the Chief of Finance of the War Department. I find in this that on active duty the pay of a lieutenant general is \$9,000 a year, of a major general, \$8,000, from which I understand that Gen. Crowder to-day on active service, this highly important active service, is getting \$8,000 a year. If he were to-day promoted under existing law to lieutenant general, he would get \$9,000 a year.

Now, the rule of retired pay is 75 per cent of the pay on active duty. I have not examined the law, and I do not know whether there is a provision in the law for retired pay for lieutenant general, but if there is, the analogy would be for retired pay three quarters of the pay on active duty, and you can easily reckon that. Instead of that they go back to the act of 1870, section 24, in which it is stated—and there is nothing about the section which is not very plain—that the pay of a general shall be \$13,500 a year, and of a lieutenant general shall be

\$11,000 a year—\$2,000 more for pay for active duty under that act than under existing law. It is very plain to be seen why they went back to the law of 1870.

It is said that the measure is simply a matter of recognition by giving him extra rank. Recognition? I say that the reference to the act of 1870 entirely dispels any such illusion, and the object of it pure and simple is financial, to give him a higher pension in the retired pay than he otherwise would have.

There are many other measures here pending before the Committee on Military Affairs—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, what will be the pay of Gen. Crowder if retired?

Mr. CRAMTON. Three-quarters of \$11,000, and the gentleman can figure that in his own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get recognition.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I would like to get recognition, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in five minutes' time I think I could make the best speech by indorsing what the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] said and what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON] said. I agree with them. If I had any doubt about it at all when we commenced the consideration of this bill, I believe I would have been converted; and if it was necessary for my salvation, I think I would have joined the church. [Laughter.]

I am acquainted with Gen. Crowder, but not intimately acquainted with him. He is not one of my constituents. I have no prejudice against him. I believe he did great and effective service. I do not believe that there is any man who has talked or will talk on this matter that will dispute it.

If I am reliably informed, and I think I am, as soon as Gen. Crowder's work was done he applied for service across the seas, and it was denied him; possibly properly so. I have no brief to defend Gen. Crowder. As I said, he is not one of my constituents. I did not know him up to the time he commenced his duties that he has performed so well.

Now, I have great respect for the soldiers. They have been well treated; they will be well treated after we are all forgotten. "Oh," says somebody, "you voted against the bonus bill." Yes, I did; and I would do it again, because it was used as a vehicle to call together and pull through a lot of legislation that would have been enormously expensive in the name of furnishing homes for the soldiers. I have answered for that to my constituents. I am willing to vote all proper aid for care of the wounded and diseased. I am ready to vote a proper bonus to stand on its own merits. So much for that.

I have little patience with the man who gets up and praises the work of Gen. Pershing and then attacks Gen. Crowder for so ably performing his duty in the enactment and writing of the law and the administration of the law that enabled Gen. Pershing to receive the support of the most magnificent Army that ever existed in the annals of time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer a suggestion. We have already parceled out time by individual recognition for two hours on each side, and in the experience of the House as practical men we know that is far more than the usual time allotted in measures of this kind. It would seem as if that ought to be sufficient for general debate. I do not want to take advantage of my parliamentary privilege by moving to rise, and I know that the House does not want to force me to that extremity. Can not we arrive at some agreement as to the remaining portion of time to be parceled out to both sides?

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman in charge of the bill is trying to arrive at an arrangement.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I would say to the gentleman that I want to speak for 15 or 20 minutes against the bill, but because of the way in which the time has been used it seems to be an impossibility to do that, unless I can get recognition from the Chair. We have no desire to extend this debate unnecessarily, but there are many gentlemen here who desire 5 or 10 minutes. There is the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TITCHER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], and a dozen other gentlemen.

Mr. LITTLE. I would like to have 20 minutes.



Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. And the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY], and several others.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It is quite obvious in my situation that I am not really disposed in principle or by strategy to give over any more time to the opposition. At the same time I think we ought to break fair and be good sports about it, and I know the gentleman from South Dakota wants to do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That is the attempt.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Would it be a fair proposition, considering that we now have four hours already allotted and partly consumed, that we should rise and fix some time in the House for the termination of the debate and agree to a division of that time and then close out absolutely with all good faith to that agreement?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Can not that be fixed right here by unanimous consent instead of going into the House?

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thought I had a sort of understanding by which I was to be recognized by the Chair at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not promise the gentleman from Kansas any preference over any other Member of the House.

Mr. LITTLE. But the Chair did promise me, as I understood it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman in charge of the bill is trying to arrive at an arrangement in respect to time.

Mr. LITTLE. As I understood it, the Chair did tell me that when these gentlemen who had already been preferred had finished their argument he would recognize me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman when those who have been already recognized, who are entitled to precedence over the gentleman, have used their time.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentlemen interested on the other side consent, under such parliamentary form as may be necessary, that one hour more be allotted and so parceled out that 30 minutes of it will be allotted to those on each side, so that whoever gets recognition of that hour will see to it that 30 minutes of it goes to the opposition?

Mr. LITTLE. That would not give time to those desiring to be heard.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The idea is so that it would really make the division here of two hours and a half on each side.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman means one hour more, in addition to the time remaining unused?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes; but with the understanding that whoever gets the recognition will divide it thirty-thirty.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] should be given the hour, if it is given to anybody.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Is that agreeable?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman can submit his request, and I shall not object to it.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I shall.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I submit the unanimous-consent request that the next recognition for one hour be with the agreement, so to speak, that 30 minutes be occupied by the side taking the hour and the other 30 minutes by the opposition.

Mr. LITTLE. The suggestion of the gentleman is not satisfactory to me and I shall have to object.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. How much does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] desire?

Mr. LITTLE. I do not imagine that I shall take over 10 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. How much time has been consumed of the different allotments that the Chair has already recognized the gentlemen for?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont has 20 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON] has 31 minutes, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] 32 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is an hour and 32 minutes, approximately?

The CHAIRMAN. Approximately; yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I ask the gentleman from Vermont to submit a unanimous-consent request that there be 45 minutes on a side. That would take care of all gentlemen who want to talk. That would give the gentleman from Kansas 10 minutes. I think we could reach an agreement upon that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Probably we could reach a unanimous-consent agreement if we could agree on who is to control the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That would be for the Chair to decide.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Chair can not decide that.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, if we can come to an understanding that there shall be, in addition to the four hours that are already allotted and partially consumed, 45 minutes additional on a side, with the understanding that the time be controlled by somebody agreed upon on one side and by him allotted so that there will be no further misunderstanding about the division of time, I shall be willing to consent to it and to make such a request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will formulate his request.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Does the gentleman expect to finish this debate to-day?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is what we are trying to do. I ask unanimous consent that, in addition to the four hours already allotted, there be 45 minutes additional of debate for each side, making an hour and a half in all; that the time on this side be in the control of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and that the extra 45 minutes on the other side be in the control of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent that, in addition to the time already allotted and partially consumed, there be an hour and a half additional, 45 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and 45 minutes by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. Is there objection?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And that at the end of that time general debate shall end.

The CHAIRMAN. And that at the end of that time general debate shall close. Is there objection?

Mr. Sisson and Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Reserving the right to object. I would like to make this inquiry. I understood the gentleman to say there is an hour and 32 minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. Something like that; an hour and 32 minutes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This would make three and a quarter hours, after which time there would be debate under the five-minute rule with a roll call or two. I do not know whether I want to miss my dinner engagement for the purpose of hearing more hot air or not.

Mr. WINGO. I demand the regular order.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RAYBURN. For the present, in order to settle this, I object to the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I ask unanimous consent that a request for one hour be allowed by the Chair, and that that time be divided 30 minutes each between the sides.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the arrangement suggested before by the gentleman from Vermont seemed to me reasonable, and in view of the importance of the bill I would have to object. I shall have to object to this.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. All right, Mr. Chairman. I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAYBURN. What is this on?

The CHAIRMAN. That the committee do now rise.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers (Mr. GREENE of Vermont and Mr. CRAMTON) reported that there were—ayes 96, noes 47.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 2867, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMTON and Mr. BARKLEY) there were—yeas 71, noes 96.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. It is clear there is no quorum present.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Did not the gentleman from Oklahoma ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thought the yeas and nays were demanded on the point of no quorum, and wondered—

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure an automatic yeas-and-nays vote would come under the motion, but I should not think so.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. It does not require a quorum to adjourn. The Chair did not understand the gentleman from Oklahoma when he made the demand for the yeas and nays on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 110, nays 205, answered "present" 1, not voting 112, as follows:

## YEAS—110.

Almon	Doremus	McKeown	Sisson
Anderson	Evans, Nebr.	McLeod	Smith, Mich.
Andrews, Nebr.	Fields	MacGregor	Steagall
Bankhead	Frear	Major	Stedman
Barbour	Gallivan	Mann, Ill.	Stephens, Miss.
Barkley	Garrett	Mapes	Stevenson
Begg	Hardy, Colo.	Michener	Summers, Tex.
Benson	Hardy, Tex.	Milligan	Sweet
Bland, Ind.	Hawley	Minahan, N. J.	Swope
Bland, Va.	Hersman	Monahan, Wis.	Taylor, Ark.
Blanton	Hoch	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Colo.
Boies	Holland	Murphy	Thompson
Bowling	Huddleston	Nelson, Wis.	Tillman
Box	Humphreys	O'Connell	Tincher
Brand	Johnson, Miss.	O'Connor	Venable
Brumbaugh	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oldfield	Vinson
Buchanan	Jones, Tex.	Oliver	Voigt
Byrnes, S. C.	Keller	Parrish	Walsh
Byrns, Tenn.	Kincheloe	Phelan	Walters
Caraway	King	Purnell	Welty
Carrs	Lampert	Quin	White, Kans.
Christopherson	Lanham	Ramsey	Wilson, La.
Collier	Lee, Ga.	Rayburn	Wingo
Cramton	Leshner	Rouse	Woodyard
Crisp	Lanthicum	Rucker	Wright
Denison	Little	Sanders, La.	Young, N. Dak.
Dent	McClintic	Sherwood	
Dominick	McDuffie	Sinclair	

## NAYS—205.

Ackerman	Ferris	Kendall	Pou
Anthony	Fess	Kiess	Radcliffe
Aswell	Fish	Kiecicka	Raker
Babka	Fisher	Knutson	Ramseyer
Bee	Flood	Kraus	Randall, Wis.
Benham	Focht	Langley	Ransley
Black	Foster	Lankford	Reber
Briggs	Freeman	Larsen	Reed, N. Y.
Brinson	French	Lea, Calif.	Reed, W. Va.
Britten	Fuller	Lehlbach	Rhodes
Brooks, Ill.	Gallagher	Luce	Ricketts
Brooks, Pa.	Gard	Lufkin	Robinson, N. C.
Burroughs	Glynn	Luhning	Robison, Ky.
Butler	Goldfogle	McAndrews	Rodenberg
Caldwell	Good	McArthur	Rogers
Campbell, Pa.	Goodall	McFadden	Romjue
Cannon	Goodykoontz	McKinley	Rose
Cantrill	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rowe
Carter	Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Rubey
Chindblom	Greene, Vt.	McPherson	Sabath
Cleary	Griffin	Madden	Sanders, Ind.
Coady	Hadley	Magee	Sanders, N. Y.
Cole	Harrison	Mansfield	Schall
Connally	Hastings	Martin	Scott
Cooper	Hays	Mays	Sells
Crago	Hernandez	Merritt	Shreve
Cullen	Hersey	Miller	Sims
Currie, Mich.	Hickey	Mondell	Sinnott
Curry, Calif.	Hicks	Montague	Smith, Idaho
Dale	Hill	Moore, Ind.	Snell
Dallinger	Hoe	Mott	Snyder
Darrow	Houghton	Nelson, Mo.	Stephens, Ohio
Davis, Tenn.	Howard	Newton, Minn.	Stiness
Dempsey	Hudspeth	Newton, Mo.	Strong, Kans.
Dewalt	Hull, Iowa	Nicholls	Strong, Pa.
Dickinson, Iowa	Hull, Tenn.	Nolan	Summers, Wash.
Dowell	Hutchinson	Ogden	Swindall
Drewry	Igoe	Olney	Tague
Dunbar	Ireland	Osborne	Taylor, Tenn.
Dupré	James, Va.	Overstreet	Temple
Engan	Jeffers	Padgett	Tilson
Echols	Johnson, Ky.	Paige	Timberlake
Edmonds	Johnson, Wash.	Park	Tinkham
Elliot	Jones, Pa.	Parker	Treadway
Elston	Juul	Patterson	Vaile
Esch	Kahn	Pell	Volstead
Evans, Mont.	Kearns	Peters	Ward
Fairfield	Kelly, Pa.	Porter	Wason

Watkins  
Watson  
Weaver  
Webster

Welling  
White, Me.  
Wilson, Ill.  
Winslow

Wood, Ind.  
Woods, Va.  
Yates  
Young, Tex.

Zihlman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Kinkaid

NOT VOTING—112.

Andrews, Md.	Dyer	Kitchin	Rowan
Ashbrook	Eagle	Kreider	Sanford
Ayres	Ellsworth	Layton	Scully
Bacharach	Emerson	Lazaro	Sears
Baer	Evans, Nev.	Loneragan	Siegel
Bell	Fordney	Longworth	Slemp
Bland, Mo.	Gandy	McCulloch	Small
Bowers	Ganly	McGlennan	Smith, Ill.
Browne	Garner	McKenzie	Smith, N. Y.
Burdick	Godwin, N. C.	McKinley	Smithwick
Burke	Goodwin, Ark.	McLane	Steele
Campbell, Kans.	Gould	Maher	Steenerson
Candler	Graham, Pa.	Mann, S. C.	Stoll
Carew	Green, Iowa	Mason	Sullivan
Casey	Griest	Mead	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Moon	Towner
Clark, Mo.	Hamilton	Mooney	Upshaw
Classon	Harrell	Moore, Va.	Vare
Copley	Haugen	Morin	Vestal
Costello	Hayden	Mudd	Volk
Crowther	Hulings	Neely	Whaley
Davey	Husted	Perlman	Wheeler
Davis, Minn.	Jacoway	Rainey, Ala.	Williams
Dickinson, Mo.	James, Mich.	Rainey, Henry T.	Wilson, Pa.
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Rainey, John W.	Wise
Dooling	Kelley, Mich.	Randall, Calif.	
Doughton	Kennedy, Iowa	Reavis	
Drane	Kennedy, R. I.	Riddick	
Dunn	Kettner	Riordan	

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. MASON with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. VARE with Mr. MOON.

Mr. BOWERS with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. BROWNE with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.

Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. RANDALL of California.

Mr. WHEELER with Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. PERLMAN with Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. LAYTON with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. GOULD with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. WISE.

Mr. HARRELD with Mr. JACOWAY.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. CLARK of Missouri.

Mr. TOWNER with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. LAZARO.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas with Mr. HAYDEN.

Mr. WILLIAMS with Mr. STOLL.

Mr. RIDDICK with Mr. UPSHAW.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. DYER with Mr. SMITHWICK.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BAER with Mr. GANLY.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. VOLK with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. STEENERSOON with Mr. CANDLER.

Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. BELL.

Mr. BURDICK with Mr. MAHER.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. CLASSON with Mr. MEAD.

Mr. VESTAL with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. DRANE.

Mr. COPLEY with Mr. AYRES.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. GARNER.

Mr. MORIN with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. DONOVAN.

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota with Mr. CAREW.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. HULINGS with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.

Mr. REAVIS with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.

Mr. KREIDER with Mr. CASEY.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. DOUGHTON.

Mr. DUNN with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. HUSTED with Mr. MCGLENNON.

Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. MANN of South Carolina.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. GANDY.

Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. MCKINLEY.



Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to answer "present." The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was at the telephone, but I am now present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT, INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ELSTON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a conference report on the bill (H. R. 15682) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

#### MAJ. GEN. CROWDER.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and pending that motion, I move that general debate on the bill S. 2867 be closed, and on that motion I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and that general debate on S. 2867 be closed, and on that motion demands the previous question. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion for the previous question.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to that motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not offer an amendment to the motion for the previous question. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] demands the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Is this question divisible?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 146, answered "present" 2, not voting 107, as follows:

#### YEAS—173.

Ackerman	Esch	Kieess	Pou
Anthony	Evans, Mont.	Kleczka	Raker
Aswell	Ferris	Kraus	Randall, Wis.
Babka	Fess	Larsen	Reber
Barbour	Fish	Lea, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.
Bea	Fisher	Leibach	Reed, W. Va.
Benham	Flood	Luce	Rhodes
Boles	Focht	Lufkin	Robinson, N. C.
Bowers	Freeman	McAndrews	Robison, Ky.
Brinson	French	McArthur	Rodenberg
Britten	Fuller	McFadden	Rogers
Brooks, Ill.	Gallagher	McKenzie	Rowe
Buchanan	Glynn	McKinley	Sanford
Burroughs	Good	McLaughlin, Mich.	Scott
Butler	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Shreve
Caldwell	Green, Iowa	McPherson	Small
Campbell, Pa.	Greene, Mass.	Madden	Smith, Idaho
Cannon	Greene, Vt.	Magee	Snell
Cantrill	Griffin	Mann, Ill.	Snyder
Carter	Hadley	Mansfield	Stephens, Ohio
Chindblom	Harrison	Martin	Stiness
Cleary	Hastings	Mays	Summers, Wash.
Coady	Hays	Merritt	Temple
Cole	Hernandez	Miller	Tilson
Cooper	Hersey	Monahan, Wis.	Timberlake
Crago	Hersman	Mondell	Tinkham
Crowther	Hickey	Montague	Valle
Currie, Mich.	Hicks	Moore, Va.	Velstead
Curry, Calif.	Hoey	Moores, Ind.	Ward
Dale	Houghton	Mott	Watson
Dallinger	Howard	Newton, Minn.	Watson
Darrow	Hudspeth	Newton, Mo.	Weaver
Davis, Tenn.	Hull, Iowa	Nicholls	Webster
Dempsey	Hull, Tenn.	Nolan	Welling
Dewalt	Hutchinson	Ogden	White, Kans.
Dickinson, Iowa	Ireland	Olney	White, Me.
Drewry	James, Va.	Osborne	Wilson, Ill.
Dunbar	Jeffers	Padgett	Winslow
Dunn	Johnson, Wash.	Paige	Wood, Ind.
Dupré	Jones, Pa.	Park	Woods, Va.
Echols	Juul	Parker	Woodyard
Edmonds	Kearns	Patterson	
Elliott	Kelly, Pa.	Pell	
Elston	Kendall	Peters	

#### NAYS—146.

Almon	Blanton	Carss	Doremus
Anderson	Bowling	Christopherson	Dowell
Andrews, Nebr.	Box	Collier	Dyer
Bankhead	Brand	Connally	Eagan
Barkley	Briggs	Crampton	Evans, Nebr.
Beggs	Brooks, Pa.	Crisp	Fairfield
Benson	Byrnes, S. C.	Cullen	Fields
Black	Byrns, Tenn.	Denison	Foster
Bland, Ind.	Campbell, Kans.	Dent	Frear
Bland, Va.	Caraway	Dominick	Gallivan

Gard	Lankford	Purnell	Summers, Tex.
Garrett	Lee, Ga.	Quin	Sweet
Goldfogle	Leshner	Radcliffe	Swindall
Goodall	Linthicum	Ramsey	Swope
Graham, Ill.	Little	Ramseyer	Tague
Griest	Luhning	Rayburn	Taylor, Ark.
Hardy, Colo.	McClintic	Richetts	Taylor, Colo.
Hardy, Tex.	McDuffie	Romjue	Taylor, Tenn.
Haugen	McKeown	Rose	Thompson
Hawley	McLeod	Rouse	Tilman
Hayden	MacGregor	Ruby	Tincher
Hill	Major	Rucker	Vinson
Hoch	Mapes	Sabath	Voigt
Holland	Michener	Sanders, Ind.	Walsh
Huddleston	Milligan	Sanders, La.	Walters
Humphreys	Minahan, N. J.	Sanders, N. Y.	Watkins
Igoe	Moore, Ohio	Schall	Welty
Johnson, Ky.	Murphy	Sells	Williams
Johnson, Miss.	Nelson, Mo.	Sherwood	Wilson, La.
Jones, Tex.	Nelson, Wis.	Sinclair	Wingo
Keller	O'Connell	Sinnot	Wright
Kincheloe	Oldfield	Sisson	Yates
King	Oliver	Smith, Mich.	Young, N. Dak.
Kinkaid	Overstreet	Stegail	Young, Tex.
Lampert	Parrish	Stedman	Zihlman
Lanham	Phelan	Stevenson	
	Porter	Strong, Kans.	

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Johnson, S. Dak. Knutson

#### NOT VOTING—107.

Andrews, Md.	Ellsworth	Lazaro	Scully
Ashbrook	Emerson	Loneragan	Sears
Ayres	Evans, Nev.	Longworth	Siegel
Bacharach	Fordney	McCulloch	Sims
Baer	Gandy	McGlennen	Slomp
Bell	Gandy	McKinstry	Smith, Ill.
Bland, Mo.	Garner	McLane	Smith, N. Y.
Browne	Godwin, N. C.	Maber	Smithwick
Brumbaugh	Goodwin, Ark.	Mann, S. C.	Steele
Burdick	Gould	Mason	Steernerson
Burke	Graham, Pa.	Mead	Stephens, Miss.
Candler	Hamill	Moon	Stoll
Carew	Hamilton	Mooney	Strong, Pa.
Casey	Harrell	Morin	Sullivan
Clark, Fla.	Hulings	Mudd	Thomas
Clark, Mo.	Husted	Neely	Towner
Classon	Jacoway	O'Connor	Treadway
Copley	James, Mich.	Perlman	Upshaw
Costello	Johnston, N. Y.	Rainey, Ala.	Vare
Davey	Kahn	Rainey, Henry T.	Venable
Davis, Minn.	Kelley, Mich.	Rainey, John W.	Vestal
Dickinson, Mo.	Kennedy, Iowa	Randall, Calif.	Volk
Donovan	Kennedy, R. I.	Ransley	Whaley
Dooling	Kettner	Reavis	Wheeler
Doughton	Kitchin	Riddick	Wilson, Pa.
Drane	Kreider	Riordan	Wise
Eagle	Layton	Rowan	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. KAHN (for) with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. BELL.

Mr. RANSLEY with Mr. O'CONNOR.

Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. SMITHWICK.

Mr. TOWNNER with Mr. STOLL.

Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BELL, and will withdraw my affirmative vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Is this motion to go into Committee of the Whole House and fix the time for debate divisible?

The SPEAKER. There are two motions. The first vote is on the motion to close debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky moves that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that is a dilatory motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not feel that he would be justified in so considering it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. We have just had a motion to adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. And another roll call.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes; and another roll call; and it is not adjournment time. We have just had a motion to adjourn voted down. It is clearly dilatory.

Mr. BARKLEY. Business has been transacted in the meantime.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That does not affect the fact that the motion is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not believe he is justified in calling the motion "dilatory" now. The gentleman from

Kentucky moves that the House do now adjourn. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 92, noes 129.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks for tellers. Those in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Fifty-eight gentlemen have risen in the affirmative—a sufficient number. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] will please take their places as tellers.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 99, noes 136.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] that the House do now adjourn. Those in favor of that motion will answer "yea" when their names are called; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 133, nays 181, answered "present" 2, not voting 112, as follows:

## YEAS—133.

Almon	Fairfield	Major	Stegall
Anderson	Foster	Mann, Ill.	Stedman
Andrews, Nebr.	Frear	Mansfield	Steenerson
Bankhead	Gallivan	Mapes	Stephens, Miss.
Barbour	Gandy	Martin	Stevenson
Barkley	Garrett	Michener	Strong, Kans.
Begg	Griest	Milligan	Sweet
Benson	Hardy, Colo.	Minahan, N. J.	Swindall
Black	Hardy, Tex.	Monahan, Wis.	Swope
Bland, Ind.	Haugen	Montague	Tague
Bland, Va.	Hawley	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Ark.
Blanton	Hersman	Murphy	Taylor, Colo.
Boles	Hoch	Nelson, Wis.	Thompson
Bowling	Holland	O'Connell	Tillman
Box	Huddleston	Oldfield	Tincher
Brand	Humphreys	Oliver	Venable
Briggs	Igoe	Overstreet	Vinson
Buchanan	Johnson, Ky.	Parrish	Voigt
Byrnes, S. C.	Johnson, Miss.	Phelan	Walsh
Byrns, Tenn.	Jones, Tex.	Purnell	Walters
Campbell, Kans.	Keller	Quin	Watkins
Caraway	Kincheloe	Ramsey	Welty
Carss	King	Randall, Wis.	White, Kans.
Christopherson	Kinkaid	Rayburn	Williams
Collier	Lampert	Ricketts	Wilson, La.
Cramton	Lanham	Rose	Wingo
Crisp	Lee, Ga.	Rouse	Woodyard
Crowther	Leshner	Rucker	Wright
Cullen	Linthicum	Sabath	Yates
Dent	Little	Sanders, La.	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	McClintic	Sherwood	Young, Tex.
Doremus	McDuffie	Sinclair	
Dowell	McLeod	Sinnot	
Evans, Nebr.	MacGregor	Sisson	

## NAYS—181.

Ackerman	Dyer	Houghton	Merritt
Anthony	Egan	Howard	Miller
Aswell	Echols	Hudspeth	Mondell
Bakka	Edmonds	Hull, Iowa	Moore, Va.
Bee	Elliott	Hull, Tenn.	Moore, Ind.
Benham	Elston	Husted	Mott
Bowers	Esch	Hutchinson	Nelson, Mo.
Brinson	Evans, Mont.	Ireland	Newton, Minn.
Brooks, Ill.	Ferris	James, Va.	Newton, Mo.
Brooks, Pa.	Fess	Jeffers	Nicholls
Burroughs	Fish	Johnson, Wash.	Nolan
Butler	Fisher	Jones, Pa.	Ogden
Caldwell	Freeman	Juhl	Olney
Campbell, Pa.	French	Kearns	Osborne
Cannon	Fuller	Kelley, Pa.	Padgett
Cantrill	Gallagher	Kettner	Paige
Carter	Gard	Kless	Park
Chindblom	Glynn	Kraus	Parker
Cleary	Godwin, N. C.	Langley	Patterson
Coady	Good	Lankford	Pell
Cole	Goodall	Larsen	Peters
Cooper	Goodykoontz	Lea, Calif.	Porter
Crago	Graham, Ill.	Leibach	Pou
Currie, Mich.	Green, Iowa	Luce	Radcliffe
Curry, Calif.	Greene, Mass.	Lufkin	Raker
Dale	Greene, Vt.	Luhning	Ramseyer
Dallinger	Griffin	McAndrews	Reber
Darrow	Hadley	McArthur	Reed, N. Y.
Davis, Minn.	Harrison	McFadden	Reed, W. Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Hastings	McKenzie	Rhodes
Dempsey	Hays	McKinley	Robinson, N. C.
Dewalt	Hernandez	McLaughlin, Mich.	Robison, Ky.
Dickinson, Iowa	Hersey	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Rodenberg
Drewry	Hickey	McPherson	Rogers
Dunbar	Hicks	Madden	Romjue
Dunn	Hill	Magee	Rowe
Dupré	Hocy	Mays	Rubey

Sanders, Ind.  
Sanders, N. Y.  
Sanford  
Schall  
Scott  
Summers, Wash.  
Summers, Tex.  
Taylor, Tenn.  
Temple  
Tilson  
Smith, Idaho

Smith, Mich.  
Snell  
Stephens, Ohio  
Stiness  
Summers, Wash.  
Summers, Tex.  
Taylor, Tenn.  
Temple  
Tilson  
Timberlake  
Tinkham  
Valle  
Volstead  
Ward  
Wason  
Watson  
Weaver  
Webster

Welling  
White, Me.  
Winslow  
Wood, Ind.  
Woods, Va.  
Zihlman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.  
Johnson, S. Dak. Knutson

## NOT VOTING—112.

Andrews, Md.	Eagle	Klecza	Riddick
Ashbrook	Ellsworth	Kreider	Riordan
Ayres	Emerson	Layton	Rowan
Bacharach	Evans, Nev.	Lazaro	Scully
Baer	Fields	Loneragan	Sears
Bell	Flood	Longworth	Siegel
Bland, Mo.	Focht	McCulloch	Sims
Britten	Fordney	McGlennan	Slomp
Browne	Ganly	McKeown	Smith, Ill.
Brumbaugh	Garner	McKiniry	Smith, N. Y.
Burdick	Goldfogle	McLane	Smithwick
Burke	Goodwin, Ark.	Maher	Snyder
Candler	Gould	Mann, S. C.	Steele
Carew	Graham, Pa.	Mason	Stoll
Casey	Hamill	Mead	Strong, Pa.
Clark, Fla.	Hamilton	Moore	Sullivan
Clark, Mo.	Harrell	Mooney	Thomas
Classon	Hayden	Morin	Towner
Connally	Hulings	Mudd	Treadway
Copley	Jacoway	Neely	Upshaw
Costello	James, Mich.	O'Connor	Vare
Davey	Johnston, N. Y.	Perman	Vestal
Denison	Kahn	Rainey, Ala.	Volk
Dickinson, Mo.	Kelley, Mich.	Rainey, Henry T.	Whaley
Donovan	Kendall	Rainey, John W.	Wheeler
Dooling	Kennedy, Iowa	Randall, Calif.	Wilson, Ill.
Doughton	Kennedy, R. I.	Ransley	Wilson, Pa.
Drane	Kitchin	Reavis	Wise

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for) with Mr. KAHN (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. CONNALLY.

Mr. DENISON with Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. KENDALL with Mr. McKEOWN.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. LONERAGAN.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from California, Mr. KAHN, and I desire to withdraw my vote of "yea" and to vote "present."

Mr. KNUTSON. I desire to withdraw my vote and to vote "present." I am paired with the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BELL.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Is there not some quick way in which we can dispose of this legislation, so that we can take up the packers' bill?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] to close debate.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMTON) there were—ayes 134, noes 89.

Mr. CRAMTON. I demand tellers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 157, nays 140, answered "present" 4, not voting 127, as follows:

## YEAS—157.

Ackerman	Crago	Flood	Houghton
Anthony	Currie, Mich.	Focht	Hudspeth
Aswell	Curry, Calif.	Freeman	Hull, Iowa
Bakka	Dale	French	Hull, Tenn.
Barbour	Dallinger	Fuller	Husted
Bee	Darrow	Gallagher	Hutchinson
Benham	Davis, Minn.	Glynn	Ireland
Black	Davis, Tenn.	Godwin, N. C.	Jeffers
Bowers	Dempsey	Goodykoontz	Johnson, Wash.
Brinson	Dickinson, Iowa	Green, Iowa	Jones, Pa.
Brooks, Ill.	Dunn	Greene, Mass.	Juhl
Brooks, Pa.	Dupré	Greene, Vt.	Kahn
Burroughs	Echols	Griffin	Kearns
Butler	Edmonds	Hadley	Kettner
Caldwell	Elliott	Harrison	Kraus
Campbell, Pa.	Eiston	Hastings	Larsen
Cannon	Esch	Hernandez	Lea, Calif.
Cantrill	Evans, Mont.	Hersey	Leibach
Carter	Ferris	Hersman	Lufkin
Chindblom	Fess	Hickey	McAndrews
Coady	Fisher	Hicks	McFadden
		Hoey	McKenzie



McKinley	Ogden	Reed, W. Va.	Timberlake
McLaughlin, Mich.	Olney	Rhodes	Thinkham
McLaughlin, Nebr.	Osborne	Robison, Ky.	Valie
McPherson	Padgett	Rodenberg	Volstead
Madden	Paige	Rogers	Ward
Magee	Parker	Rowe	Watson
Mansfield	Patterson	Sabath	Watson
Martin	Pell	Sanders, N. Y.	Weaver
Mays	Peters	Sanford	Webster
Merritt	Porter	Scott	Welling
Miller	Pou	Shreve	White, Me.
Moore, Va.	Radeliffe	Smith, Idaho	Wilson, Ill.
Moore, Ind.	Raker	Stephens, Ohio	Winslow
Mott	Ramseyer	Stiness	Wood, Ind.
Newton, Minn.	Randall, Wis.	Summers, Wash.	
Newton, Mo.	Reber	Temple	
Nicholls	Reed, N. Y.	Tilson	

## NAYS—140.

Almon	Fairfield	McLeod	Sisson
Anderson	Fields	MacGregor	Smith, Mich.
Andrews, Nebr.	Foster	Major	Smithwick
Bankhead	Gallivan	Mapes	Steagall
Barkley	Gard	Michener	Stedman
Begg	Garrett	Milligan	Steenerson
Benson	Graham, Ill.	Minahan, N. J.	Stevenson
Bland, Ind.	Griest	Monahan, Wis.	Strong, Kans.
Bland, Va.	Hardy, Colo.	Moore, Ohio	Summers, Tex.
Boies	Hardy, Tex.	Murphy	Sweet
Bowling	Haugen	Nelson, Mo.	Swindall
Box	Hawley	Nelson, Wis.	Tague
Brand	Hoch	O'Connell	Taylor, Ark.
Briggs	Huddleston	Oldfield	Taylor, Colo.
Byrnes, S. C.	Humphreys	Oliver	Taylor, Tenn.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Igoe	Overstreet	Thompson
Campbell, Kans.	James, Va.	Park	Tillman
Caraway	Johnson, Ky.	Parrish	Tincher
Carss	Johnson, Miss.	Purnell	Venable
Christopherson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Quin	Vinson
Cole	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, Henry T.	Voigt
Collier	Keller	Ramsey	Walsh
Connally	Kincheloe	Rayburn	Walters
Cramton	King	Ricketts	Welty
Crisp	Kinkaid	Romjue	White, Kans.
Cullen	Kreider	Rose	Williams
Denison	Lanham	Rouse	Wilson, La.
Dent	Lankford	Rubey	Woods, Va.
Dominick	Lee, Ga.	Rucker	Woodyard
Doramus	Leshner	Sanders, Ind.	Wright
Dowell	Linthicum	Sanders, La.	Yates
Drewry	Little	Sells	Yeung, N. Dak.
Dunbar	Luhring	Sherwood	Young, Tex.
Eagan	McClintic	Sinclair	Zihlman
Evans, Nebr.	McDuffie	Sinnett	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Crowther	Knutson	Schall	Wingo
----------	---------	--------	-------

## NOT VOTING—127.

Andrews, Md.	Evans, Nev.	Layton	Riddick
Ashbrook	Fordney	Lazaro	Riordan
Ayres	Frear	Loneragan	Robinson, N. C.
Bacharach	Gandy	Longworth	Rowan
Baer	Ganly	Luce	Scully
Bell	Garner	McArthur	Sears
Bland, Mo.	Goldfogle	McCulloch	Siegel
Blanton	Good	McGlennon	Sims
Britten	Goodwin, Ark.	McKeown	Slemp
Browne	Gould	McKiniry	Small
Brumbaugh	Graham, Pa.	McLane	Smith, Ill.
Burdick	Hamill	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Burke	Hamilton	Mann, Ill.	Snell
Candler	Harrell	Mann, S. C.	Snyder
Carew	Hayden	Mason	Steele
Casey	Hays	Mead	Stoll
Clark, Fla.	Hill	Mondell	Strong, Pa.
Clark, Mo.	Holland	Montague	Sullivan
Classon	Howard	Moore	Swope
Cooper	Hulings	Mooney	Thomas
Copley	Jacoway	Morin	Towner
Costello	James, Mich.	Mudd	Treadway
Davey	Johnston, N. Y.	Neely	Upshaw
Dewalt	Kelley, Mich.	Nolan	Vare
Dickinson, Mo.	Kendall	O'Connor	Vestal
Donovan	Kennedy, Iowa	Perlmann	Volk
Dooling	Kennedy, R. I.	Phelan	Watkins
Doughton	Kless	Rainey, Ala.	Whaley
Drane	Klitchn	Rainey, John W.	Wheeler
Eagle	Klecza	Randall, Calif.	Wilson, Pa.
Ellsworth	Lampert	Ransley	Wise
Emerson	Langley	Reavis	

So the motion to close debate was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. HOWARD (for) with Mr. WINGO (against).

Mr. HILL (for) with Mr. CROWTHER (against).

General pairs:

Mr. FREAR with Mr. BLANTON.

Mr. COOPER with Mr. PHELAN.

Mr. GOOD with Mr. DEWALT.

Mr. MANN of Illinois with Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. HAYS with Mr. HOLLAND.

Mr. MONDELL with Mr. WATKINS.

Mr. KLECZKA with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.

Mr. KLESS with Mr. McLANE.

Mr. LAMPERT with Mr. RAINEY of Alabama.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. LUCE with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.

Mr. McARTHUR with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. NOLAN with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.

Mr. SNELL with Mr. SCHALL.

Mr. SWOPE with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. HOWARD, and I withdraw my vote of "no" and answer "present."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I think I must have been in the corridor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my vote of "no" and answer "present." I am paired with the gentleman from New York, Mr. SNELL.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the motion of the gentleman from Vermont be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that that motion is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the further consideration of the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER. But the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. On the motion to close debate, but not on the motion to go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the motion I have made, it was based on the fact that the motion for the previous question had not been made except on the motion to close debate. A request for a division of the question was made by the gentleman from Mississippi before we voted on the previous question, and the vote on the previous question was only with reference to that part of the motion. It was my understanding that the way would then be open for the other motion, the preferential motion to lay it on the table.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. The motion of the gentleman from Vermont now pending is that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. That motion is not in order after the Committee of the Whole House has reported to the House that it has come to no resolution on the measure, which has been considered in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see any basis for the gentleman's statement.

Mr. WALSH. This is not a Union Calendar bill. We resolved ourselves into Committee of the Whole House, and now the motion is that we resolve ourselves into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the motion that way.

Mr. WALSH. I think the gentleman from Vermont will admit that the motion he made was to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was not aware of it.

Mr. WALSH. And the Chair stated it in that form.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not pretend to remember as to that, but he did not suppose so.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I did make the motion in that language, and I ask now to amend the motion, as I have a right in the House to do. I had in mind to resolve ourselves into committee from which we had just emerged and expected to use that language.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the previous question has been ordered on his motion to go into committee, the gentleman can not move to amend; and if it has not been ordered, my motion to lay on the table is in order and has preference.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I repeated the usual formula, but used unnecessary words. I had in mind the committee from which we had just emerged, but a Member has a right to amend his motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a right to amend before the previous question is ordered.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the unfortunate situation we are in, and to give the gentleman time, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MONDELL. That is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is dilatory.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It is not the duty of the Chair to assist the gentleman from Vermont out of his unfortunate predicament, is it?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman from Vermont has not asked the Speaker to take him out of any predicament. The

gentleman from Vermont is quite aware of the motion that he made.

Mr. CRAMTON. More than that, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Vermont can not take himself out of his predicament.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes, he can; because he moved the previous question on the second part of his motion.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then that substantiates what I have been urging to the Chair.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am not debating that with the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. That being true, we are in agreement.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood that the previous question was ordered on both motions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I refresh the Chair's recollection about that?

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. When we got back into the House from the Committee of the Whole House, the gentleman from Vermont moved that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of this bill, and pending that motion, he moved then to close debate, and on that motion he moved the previous question, and it was upon ordering the previous question upon the motion to close debate that we voted upon the previous question.

The SPEAKER. And not upon both motions?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not upon both.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, that is a correct statement of the situation.

The SPEAKER. If that is correct, then the previous question has been ordered only upon the motion to close debate. There is no reason for ordering it on the motion to go into committee.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the Chair will permit, I also desire to call the attention of the Chair to the practice long standing in the House which permits a motion made in mistake of language to be corrected upon the floor. The formulas of this House are repeated over and over—

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Kentucky is correct, then the previous question has been ordered on the motion to close debate.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; and my motion to lay upon the table is in order and is now pending.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Chair rule that the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to lay on the table is in order?

The SPEAKER. At first blush the Chair would say that it is.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that led us into this dilemma. The motion to close debate was predicated upon the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Personally, I think the gentleman ought to be permitted to change his motion.

The SPEAKER. He certainly could change it if the previous question has not been ordered.

Mr. WINGO. I think the House ought to give him unanimous consent, or if that be not granted then he could withdraw his motion, and the Chair could recognize him to make the original motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] to lay upon the table is not in order, unless he can cite authority to the contrary. Has the gentleman any authorities to cite the Chair? The Chair would be very glad to hear them.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am just trying to find them. I had them a few minutes ago, but pending that, in order to permit me to find some authority, and the gentleman from Vermont to find some authority, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is dilatory.

Mr. CRAMTON. I submit to the Speaker that the situation is a little unusual. We have now spent 5 or 10 minutes trying to find out where we are at, and it rather saves the situation.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Following the long practice of the House, I repeated—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, has the Chair ruled upon the point of order, and are any motions affecting the matter in order at all until the point of order has been disposed of?

The SPEAKER. To what point of order does the gentleman refer?

Mr. WALSH. Is the point of order which I made still pending, or has it been disposed of?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman to call attention to a fact which the Chair was not aware of. The Chair is satisfied from what has been stated that the gentleman from Massachusetts is correct. What is the point of order that the gentleman made, based upon that?

Mr. WALSH. The point of order is that the motion of the gentleman from Vermont has made is not in order upon this measure, which has already been considered in Committee of the Whole House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is correct.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, before any ruling is made, may I make a statement? Following the long practice of the House, I intended to make the motion in its usual parliamentary form, but I misstated it, and had started to correct it when the Speaker went on to repeat the motion and to proceed with the business of the House, assuming that it was made in its correct form, because we had emerged from the committee which I intended to name, and into which we would go back if we went back at all. Therefore I supposed that the matter had been passed over as a usual slip of the tongue is and that no more attention was paid to it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman has now the right to modify his motion.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then I ask to modify it—to state it in the correct terms.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House, and on that motion I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont, the Chair understands, has withdrawn his motion and so modified it that the motion is now that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Can he do that?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he has the right to do that in spite of objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, there being nothing now before the House, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is mistaken; there is a motion pending before the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Following the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to lay on the table the original motion of the gentleman from Vermont, I was recognized to move that the further consideration of this measure be indefinitely postponed, which is a preferential motion. What is the status of that?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will wait. The Chair thinks the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is not in order.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. There can not be so many pending at one time. The Chair presumes the gentleman relies upon Rule XVI, clause 4?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

The SPEAKER (reading)—

When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received but to adjourn, to lay on the table, for the previous question.

Now, the motion to go into the committee is not a question of debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then does the Chair hold where the House must resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole in order to debate a question that in the House it is not in order at any time to move to postpone indefinitely the consideration of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Surely the Chair does not—

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Massachusetts having insisted on his point of order and being sustained, that it does away with both the motion of the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Kentucky, because they are predicated upon a motion which the gentleman from Vermont has abandoned. The gentleman from Vermont has now made a motion to go into the Committee of the Whole, and on that he has demanded the previous question. That is the only motion that is in order, because the previous question shuts out all other motions.

The SPEAKER. That is exactly—

Mr. WINGO. That is the situation now.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, may I supplement that with this plain matter-of-fact statement?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can by unanimous consent.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It is very plain, Mr. Speaker—



Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it is not debatable.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Vermont on the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Massachusetts on the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order that pending the motion that the gentleman from Vermont originally made, the House having voted to close debate upon the matter on which he moved to resolve the House into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, that that action of the House will not now be in force under another motion, namely, to consider the matter in the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is just the point I desired to bring to the Speaker's attention.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is disposed to think that the gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. May I be heard?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I made the usual motion after the ordinary practice of the House and misstated it by the addition of words. I attempted to correct it at once, but the proceedings were taken up as they were. It is manifest the Chair understood the motion as I intended it, and being aware that day after day, and day after day—

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that debate is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not debating. The Chair has control of the time on a point of order.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Day after day when gentlemen on the floor stated a motion in language which is palpably inaccurate the Chair has as a matter of practice restated it in proper form, and it is obvious to everybody who listened that the intent was to state it in the proper form. We had emerged from the Committee of the Whole House and it was only to that committee we could return. It is obvious that was the intention of the motion, and because of a palpable error in the statement of my motion I understood the Chair quickly to recognize that fact, and being aware of it put it in its proper form. Now, I did not suppose I had lost rights under a practice which is common in this House and which simply depends upon somebody taking a technical advantage of what was a palpable error. It is very manifest I could not make the motion that I am reported to have made; it would be of no avail, and yet the House accepted it and has been acting under it all this time with intervening business of roll calls.

Everybody in the House had an exact notice of the motion as it was intended, but at this eleventh hour somebody comes in and states the palpable error in the original motion. The point of order comes too late.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CRAMTON. Have I recognition, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. CRAMTON. All the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] urges has been passed upon by the Speaker. He has ruled that the former motion to go into committee was a nullity and that the former motion was so complete a nullity that it would not sustain the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] or the motion that I have made. Being a nullity, the latter motion to limit debate, a motion that could only be made with a proper motion to go into committee pending, the motion then to limit debate also was a nullity. And now the gentleman, with the consent of the House or otherwise, starts all over again. He makes his new motion now to go into committee in proper form, and if he desires he can move to limit debate, and the House can pass upon the question.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. May I ask, if the gentleman please, if he means to be understood that during the last hour and a half the House has misunderstandingly acted on a nullity?

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUSTED. Is it not always, Mr. Speaker, within the province of the Chair to correct a palpable error which is one of form only, and, if that is so, is not that situation applicable to the motion of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE]? The gentleman from Vermont moved to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. It is perfectly plain that such a motion would not lie; that that was not the motion intended by the gentleman from Vermont, because the House in Committee of the Whole House had already been considering the bill in the Committee of the Whole House. And it

seems to me that is really a matter of form only, a mere technical error, which the Chair could correct of his own motion.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that after the House has acted upon some subsidiary or incidental motions, it is then within the power of the Speaker to correct what the gentleman who made the motion admits was an error?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already ruled upon that.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I move we adjourn. [Cries of "Regular order!"] I withdraw that motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The facts are these: The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], it is admitted, instead of moving, as he intended, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, moved that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The Chair certainly did not notice that, and presumes very few persons did notice it; but it has been admitted, and the Chair has already ruled that that was invalid, and the gentleman has withdrawn the motion and offered a new motion, on which he has moved the previous question. Now, the point is raised: Is the motion which the gentleman made, that debate upon this bill be closed, also invalid, because it was predicated upon the previous inaccurate motion? Everyone will admit that there was no deceit upon the House; that the House was not misled; and that nobody lost any rights by the mistake of the gentleman which probably very few noticed, and which certainly influenced no one's vote.

The Chair thinks that the motion to close debate which was made and voted upon by the House was not so dependent upon the original erroneous statement that he made as to be invalid because the original one was a mistake. And the Chair holds that the House has voted to close debate on this bill. Now, the gentleman moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, and on that he moves the previous question.

Mr. WALSH. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. I make the point of order that the motion of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] is not in order, he having previously made a motion upon which a point of order was made, and it has been sustained, and that it is not now in order for him to renew a motion for the further consideration of this bill, notwithstanding the fact that the House has, pending action upon the original motion, voted to fix debate; that he can not now, after the House has voted to fix debate, make another motion to consider the bill in another manner, under a separate motion from the original motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules that point of order. It is a custom to move to close debate pending a motion to go into Committee of the Whole, but the Chair does not see that one is so dependent on the other that an error in one invalidates the other.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the Speaker permit?

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the Speaker is still willing to hear just a suggestion as to the status, I wish to say that the gentleman from Vermont made a motion to go into committee, and then pending that made a motion which he could not have made except a motion to go into committee was pending. That was to limit debate. The House voted to limit debate. Now supposing, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Where does the gentleman get his authority for saying that he could not have made the motion unless the other was pending?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not so understand it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Supposing that the House then voted down the motion to go into Committee of the Whole; would that limitation of debate carry over to some time in the distant future?

The SPEAKER. That is a question to be decided when the case arises. The Chair sees no reason why it should not.

Mr. CRAMTON. I was urging this: Logically the motion to limit debate could only be made while a motion was pending to go into committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not aware of that.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the motion to go into committee is lost, then the closing of debate would fall with it, and the situation is the same when the motion to go into committee fails for any other reason.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. In the event that a motion is unintentionally misstated, but in language sufficient to convey to the House the obvious meaning and intent, and the situation

itself obviously suggesting it, and a roll call takes place afterwards, is it in order to make a point of order on the original motion, or has the Member lost his day in court?

The SPEAKER. That has already been ruled on.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Vermont having made a motion for the previous question, is there not 20 minutes' debate on a side?

The SPEAKER. There is not. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] that the previous question be ordered.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CRAMTON. A division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. On this votes the ayes are 107—

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont moves that the House do now adjourn. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until tomorrow, Saturday, February 19, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV,

417. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination and survey of Turtle Bayou, Tex. (H. Doc. No. 1010), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with map.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14492) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to release the St. Louis & San Francisco Railway Co. from reconstructing its highway and approaches across its bridge at Memphis, Tenn., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1337), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WHITE of Kansas, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15861) to confirm private claim 61, in the township of Ecorse, Wayne County, Mich., reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1335), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

The SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring legislation to require marking of percentages of wool in fabrics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts, favoring the creation or designation of some agency of the Federal Government with full power to ascertain facts and disseminate information and to regulate and control the production, sorting, grading, transportation, and distribution of coal to the several States to secure so far as possible a sufficient supply of coal of good quality at reasonable prices to the consumers in the several States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCARTHUR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging Congress to pass laws that will require every manufacturer or handler or seller of woolen fabrics and woolen garments to place a tag thereon stating the exact percentage of virgin wool and also how much and what other ma-

terials enter into such cloth; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging a survey of the port of Port Orford with a view of building a breakwater or jetty for said port; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TOWNER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Porto Rico, urging the extension and development of their present system of government under democratic principles; to the Committee on the Territories.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 16123) granting a pension to Charles Frizzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 16124) for the relief of Gilbert Smith Galbraith, a commander on the active list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 16125) to provide for the payment of taxes to the city of Hoboken, N. J., on certain property acquired by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 16126) granting a pension to Joseph Lambert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5872. By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Hanover, Pa., urging the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill, H. H. 10925; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5873. By Mr. CLEARY: Petition of the Kings Highway Board of Trade and certain citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5874. By Mr. CRAMTON: Resolution of St. Clair Lodge, No. 14, International Shipmasters' Association, St. Clair, Mich., protesting against the passage of that part of Senate bill 4542 which provides for the transfer of the Hydrographic Office from the Navy Department to the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5875. Also, resolution of the Commercial Club, Lapeer, Mich., protesting against the recent ruling of Attorney General Palmer classifying butter as adulterated, and thereby subject to a 10-cent-per-pound revenue tax, if churned from cream the acidity of which has been partially neutralized with limewater to make efficient pasteurization possible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5876. Also, resolution of the board of delegates of the Michigan State Farm Bureau, protesting against the placing of a tariff on Canadian timber or lumber imported from Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5877. Also, protest of the members of Branch 403, Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Association, Port Huron, Mich., against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5878. Also, protest of the League of Catholic Women, of Mount Clemens, Mich., against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5879. By Mr. FESS: Petition of sundry citizens of Urbana, Ohio, urging the freedom of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5880. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of 90 citizens of Mendota, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5881. Also, petition of Hon. J. N. Francis and sundry other citizens of Morris, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Fess-Capper bills, S. 3950 and H. R. 12652; to the Committee on Education.

5882. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, opposing the \$10,000,000 appropriation for the Muscle Shoals project; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5883. Also, petition of McNeil & Higgins Co., of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of the cold-storage bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5884. Also, petition of the Chicago (Ill.) Railway Equipment Co., opposing the passage of the Federal live-stock and the Federal coal bills, S. 3944 and S. 4828; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5885. Also, petition of the Massachusetts Civic Alliance, of Boston, Mass., opposing the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.



5886. Also, petition of the Travelers' Protective Association of America, favoring an amendment of the income-tax laws to permit deduction of cost of meals and lodging, when traveling, from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5887. By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petitions of 600 members of the Holy Name Society, 500 members of the Catholic Women's Club, 800 members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the Fall River Cathedral Holy Name Society, 600 members of the St. Peter and St. Paul Holy Name Society, 2,000 members of the Fall River Council, No. 86, Knights of Columbus, members of the Isabella Assumption Circle, No. 74, Rev. Francis Bradley, Cathedral Rectory, all of Fall River, Mass.; the Mansfield Council, No. 420, Knights of Columbus, of Mansfield, Mass.; and Monsignor James Coyle, pastor of St. Mary's parish, of Taunton, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5888. By Mr. HULINGS: Petition of St. Joseph's Society, residents of St. Marys, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5889. Also, petition of citizens of St. Marys, Pa., opposing the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5890. Also, petition of the Consumers' League of Eastern Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5891. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of West Pittsburgh Lodge No. 74, Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel & Tin Workers, favoring the removal of trade embargo against Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5892. Also, petition of Holy Rosary Church, of Pittsburgh, Pa., opposing the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5893. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, urging the continuation of the passport office in New York City; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5894. Also, Petition of Federal Employees' Union, No. 412, St. Marks Place, New York City, favoring the \$240 bonus for Federal employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5895. Also, petition of the American Engineering Council of the Federated American Engineering Societies, Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of H. R. 15662, known as the Nolan treaty patent bill; to the Committee on Patents.

5896. By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: Petition of residents of Racine, Wis., requesting an amendment to the Volstead enforcement law permitting the manufacture and sale of beer and light wines; also protesting against the McKellar bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5897. By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: Petition of Rev. William A. Maher and 300 others, protesting against the Smith-Towner bills (S. 1017 and H. R. 7); to the Committee on Education.

5898. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petitions of 116 women and 112 men, residents of Sheldon, Wyoming County, N. Y., in opposition to the so-called Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5899. By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of 64 citizens and voters of the seventeenth congressional district, urging an amendment to the prohibition laws that will restore light wines and beer under reasonable restrictions, and opposing the passage of the McKellar bill, known as the Sunday blue law bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5900. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Tupper Lake, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

5901. By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of the Crookston Association of Public Affairs, Crookston, Minn., against the importation of eggs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5902. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, favoring temporary protective legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5903. By Mr. WOODYARD: Petitions of the Citizen's Building Association, of Parkersburg, W. Va., favoring change in the present tax laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5904. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition adopted by the Lavern J. Thompson Post, American Legion, of Cavalier, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of legislation providing better hospital facilities, etc., for disabled war veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5905. Also, petition of the German Catholic Societies of Richardson, N. Dak., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

5906. Also, petition of the Pierce County Farm Bureau, Rugby, N. Dak., remonstrating against a tariff duty on importations of lumber from Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5907. By Mr. YATES: Petition of E. K. Howe, of the Robert Dollar Co., New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 7204; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5908. Also, petition of W. F. Burrows, of Illinois, protesting vigorously against House bill 15995; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5909. Also, petition of A. E. Keith, of Chicago, of the Automatic Electric Co., favoring the passage of House bill 15420; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5910. Also, petition of D. O. Thompson, of Chicago, favoring the passage of the packer legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5911. Also, petition of C. H. Bonnell, of Taylorville, Ill., favoring the passage of the Gronna packer bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5912. Also, petition of W. D. Anger, of Rockford, Ill., urging legislation concerning 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5913. Also, petition of Mrs. Anna Koor, secretary of St. Monica's Society of St. Joseph's Church, Aurora, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5914. Also, petitions of W. H. La Boyteaux, of New York City, and the Freeport Chamber of Commerce, Freeport, Ill., C. A. Stelle, manager, protesting against the Federal live-stock bill and the Federal coal bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5915. Also, petition of C. A. Stelle, of the Freeport Chamber of Commerce, Freeport, Ill., favoring the increase in appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and for the Consular and Diplomatic Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5916. Also, petition of H. A. McCabe, of Streator, Ill., favoring the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 19, 1921.

(Legislative day of Monday, February 14, 1921.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

### CREDENTIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certificate of the governor of New York certifying to the election of JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr., as a United States Senator for the term beginning March 4, 1921, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d of November, 1920, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New York a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1921.

Witness: Nathan L. Miller, governor, and the great seal hereto affixed at Albany, this 14th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1921.

NATHAN L. MILLER, Governor,  
JOHN J. LYONS,  
Secretary of State.

SUPPLY OF COMMERCIAL FERTILIZER (S. DOC. NO. 410).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture in response to Senate resolution 435, January 26, 1921, transmitting a statement on the fertilizer situation prepared by Prof. Milton Whitney, Chief of the Bureau of Soils, etc., which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FLETCHER subsequently said: The Secretary of Agriculture has submitted his report in response to Senate resolution 435, which I offered regarding fertilizer and the fertilizer situation. I ask that it may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

### CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Culberson	Frelinghuysen	Heflin
Ball	Curtis	Gay	Henderson
Brandeggee	Dial	Gerry	Jones, N. Mex.
Calder	Dillingham	Gooding	Jones, Wash.
Capper	Fernald	Gronna	Kellogg
Chamberlain	Fletcher	Harris	Kenyon
Colt	France	Harrison	King